



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 10, 2014

No. 107

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2014.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As you are aware, the time previously appointed for the next meeting of the House is 10 a.m. today for morning hour debate. This is to notify you, pursuant to clause 12(c) of rule I, of an imminent impairment of the place of reconvening at that time. The impairment is due to an industrial accident.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. IRVING,
Sergeant at Arms.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 12(c) of rule I, and the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Speaker dispensed with morning-hour debate today and notified Members accordingly.

PRAYER

Rabbi Dovid Cohen, Young Israel of the West Side, New York, New York, offered the following prayer:

Master of the Universe, continue to grant compassion and understanding to this august body. We live in a world "on fire," where there is turmoil throughout the globe; a world that is ravaged by terror and barbarism; a world where youthful potential and its rich contributions are instantaneously destroyed.

Yesterday, in these hallowed Halls, the United States Congress posthumously honored Raoul Wallenberg

for his humanitarian efforts in saving Jews during the Holocaust. Please, God, enable this body to continue to advocate for decency and be the moral compass of our Nation.

Next week begins the 3-week period of Jewish mourning over the destruction of our temples in Jerusalem. It is an inauspicious time, a time focused on the iniquity of baseless hatred between brothers. Please, God, enable this institution to serve as a reminder that in a world of darkness, one small candle can light up the world.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MEALS ON WHEELS

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the important work of

Meals on Wheels, a community-based organization that exemplifies the American spirit: neighbors helping neighbors, serving those in need, and working together to make our communities a better place.

Each day, volunteers from over 5,000 Meals on Wheels programs across the Nation deliver over a million meals to elderly citizens. Recently, I had the opportunity to visit with one of these organizations in my district, Meals-on-Wheels of Johnson and Ellis Counties.

In theirs and other programs like it, an army of dedicated volunteers share the motto of being their brother's keeper, delivering a hot lunch and breakfast for the next day to their elderly and homebound neighbors, which also provides these individuals with a caring visit from loving volunteers. Lives are touched every day because the investment is made in helping them remain in their homes.

Today, I salute the thousands of donors, funders, supporters, volunteers, boards of directors, and workers, and especially those individuals served by Meals on Wheels. Organizations like this are what America is all about: loving your neighbor and serving those in need.

In God we trust.

NATIONAL GAY BLOOD DRIVE

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the National Gay Blood Drive, because I know that being gay does not implicitly make someone an unsafe blood donor.

Our current FDA policy paints all gay and bisexual men with the same brush, banning them for life based solely on orientation instead of focusing on actual risky behavior.

This Friday, at National Gay Blood Drives in 61 cities across our country,

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6039

gay and bisexual men will stand with straight allies to call for an end to this discriminatory policy.

Implemented in 1983 during the height of the HIV crisis, the outdated policy is based on unjustifiable fear and bigotry instead of science and facts. But it is 2014. We have advanced blood screening and we know much more about how HIV is transmitted. We need a revised policy to match—a revision blood donation agencies support. We can no longer treat gay and bisexual men as second-class citizens or turn away healthy would-be donors who could be providing lifesaving blood.

I urge all my colleagues to support the National Gay Blood Drive and help America move one step closer to true equality for all.

OBAMA DEMANDS \$3.7 BILLION FOR BORDER SECURITY

(Mr. BROOKS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in 2012, Obama evicted 649,000 illegal aliens. In 2008, Bush evicted 1.2 million illegal aliens, which was 80 percent better than Obama. In 1993, Clinton evicted 1.3 million illegal aliens, which was 98 percent better than Obama.

Now, Obama demands \$3.7 billion from American taxpayers to cover up the worst border security record in decades.

Out-of-control debt risks an American insolvency and bankruptcy. Obama's border mistakes must be paid for by cutting foreign aid, not paying illegal aliens billions of dollars a year in fraudulent tax refunds; or by better government management, and not by borrowing more money.

Lack of money did not create America's porous border problem. Incompetent border policy did.

Presidents Bush and Clinton did better border security with far less money. President Obama should do the same.

THE GOOD NEWS ON JOBS COULD HAVE BEEN BETTER

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the good news is the June jobs report has been described by some as a "blockbuster" and a "great success," but it could have been better.

In the June report, the economy added over 288,000 private sector jobs. That is five straight months in which 200,000 private sector jobs were added. This is the best performance since the boom years in the late 1990s.

The good news is that unemployment is down to pre-recession levels, but the bad news is that it could have been better.

Extending emergency unemployment benefits would have added another

200,000 jobs, according to the Congressional Budget Office. This, combined with the government shutdown, fights over the debt ceiling, governing by crisis, all prevented job growth from being even stronger.

Our economy has proved to be incredibly resilient. Imagine what we could do if 6 months from now we extended unemployment benefits; reauthorized the highway trust fund, which preserves another 700,000 jobs; and reauthorized the Export-Import Bank. All of this would create jobs.

Let's work together to create these jobs and pass these important programs.

STAND WITH ISRAEL

(Mr. DESANTIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the terrorist group Hamas launched three long-range rockets targeting an Israeli nuclear reactor.

Hamas, an arm of the Muslim Brotherhood, has received support from the totalitarian government in Iran. Hamas is firmly dedicated to the destruction of Israel.

Rather than back our ally, the Obama administration has exhibited a false moral equivalency that has bordered on outright hostility to Israel. Current law requires U.S. aid to the Palestinian Authority be suspended if the PA is Hamas-influenced. Yet the Obama administration has continued to fund the Hamas-Fatah unity government with U.S. taxpayer dollars.

Just this week, as the administration is underwriting the Hamas-Fatah government, the White House sends a special assistant to Israel to condemn the Jewish state for failing to broker a peace agreement with the Palestinian Authority that includes the Islamist terrorists in Hamas. This criticism was launched in the midst of receiving rocket fire.

Rather than criticize Israel during this trying time, the United States should be standing firmly in favor of Israel's right to defend itself against an enemy that seeks the destruction of the Jewish state.

IMMIGRATION REFORM AND THE ARRIVAL OF UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of comprehensive immigration reform and to address the growing number of unaccompanied children arriving from Central America.

It has been over a year since the Senate passed bipartisan reform legislation to strengthen the border and provide a pathway to normalization and earned citizenship for those already

here. The Senate passed the bill with 68 votes. Mr. Speaker, the Senate often-times can't get 60 votes to turn on the lights over there. So this legislation has broad support, and I urge its immediate consideration.

Last week, I visited our immigration intake facilities in McAllen, Texas, on our southern border. I saw hundreds of recently arrived unaccompanied children, many traumatized by the violence in their home countries and the long, dangerous journey to our country.

Americans are a compassionate people and, as Americans, we know that these children we are talking about need to be treated as children.

The President has asked for emergency funds to further secure our border and give the Border Patrol the resources they need to make sure these children are treated with care and dignity while they are in our custody. If this Chamber is serious about border security, it would immediately consider the President's request and give our folks on the border what they need to do their job.

FAA PROPOSAL TO UPDATE FLIGHT SIMULATORS

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Federal Aviation Administration's proposal to update flight simulators to more accurately warn of emergency situations. Though these situations are rare, when they occur, the result is catastrophic.

In my own western New York community, Continental Flight 3407 tragically crashed in February of 2009, killing all on board, because the pilots did not know how to compensate for loss of speed caused by ice on the plane's wings, which caused an aerodynamic stall.

Among the provisions included in aviation safety reforms passed by Congress in the wake of the Flight 3407 crash are requirements that pilots undergo additional ground and flight training in order to prepare for catastrophic events.

I urge the FAA to act quickly to approve and implement these new simulators to comply with the law and give pilots the best possible training for the safety of the flying public.

□ 1215

PROTECTING OUR SOUTHERN BORDER

(Mr. LAMBORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, the crisis we are currently witnessing at our southern border is the direct result of the Obama administration's selective enforcement of our Nation's immigration laws. Through its repeated inaction and disregard for border security,

this administration has created a magnet for illegal immigration.

This is endangering the lives of children and is adding additional strains to our already overtaxed taxpayers, and now, the President says he needs \$3.7 billion from Congress to address the problem that his disregard for our laws has created. Virtually none of this money addresses the real problem of securing our border.

We need to deploy the National Guard to the border. The National Guard is well equipped to handle this humanitarian crisis. It would provide critical relief to our Border Patrol, allowing them to better concentrate on protecting our border.

My amendment to the NDAA of transferring \$5 million to the Army National Guard would do exactly that.

ECONOMY

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, June saw nearly 300,000 new jobs added to the economy, lowering unemployment to the lowest level since 2008. Still, we must do more for America's economic security. This includes ensuring that Americans are able to earn a living wage and that vulnerable families can depend on unemployment insurance in tough times.

This week, I voted for the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act because it will help individuals acquire the skills they need to succeed in the workforce and will help employers find the skilled workers they need to compete in the global economy.

Monday, I had the honor of visiting Mussman's Back Acres in Grant Park, Illinois, which is a family-owned egg farm that is operated by brothers Keith, Craig, and Kevin Mussman and their dedicated employees. Mussman's has 400,000 organic-fed layers, and it distributes eggs in the United States, Mexico, and Canada.

This is exactly the type of small business Congress should be promoting. That is why I will continue touring family farms and small businesses in Illinois—to bring their ideas and concerns back to Washington. Together, we can help our businesses thrive, and we can protect our workers. It is key to our recovery.

HONORING RAOUL WALLENBERG WITH THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Raoul Gustaf Wallenberg of Sweden for his heroism during World War II.

Yesterday, I was humbled to join my colleagues in the U.S. Capitol to present Wallenberg's Congressional

Gold Medal to his half sister, Nina Lagergren.

In 1944, President Roosevelt appointed Wallenberg to the War Refugee Board to protect more than 700,000 Jews living in Budapest. With assistance from Sweden, Wallenberg denounced violence, exemplified unparalleled courage, and perpetuated the highest of humanitarian ideals.

Although he mysteriously disappeared en route to Moscow at the end of the war, Wallenberg is credited with saving 100,000 Jews from certain death in concentration camps. In 1981, Congress awarded Wallenberg honorary citizenship posthumously, one of only six other non-U.S. citizens so honored, including Sir Winston Churchill.

Wallenberg's work endures as a model of service to humankind and as a model of courage in the face of danger.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to do the right thing: to work across the aisle and take swift action to address the humanitarian crisis that our Nation is currently facing.

As a parent, I look at the situation at our Texas border, and I think of the circumstances that would lead my wife and me to send our 8-year-old on a dangerous journey thousands of miles away from home without us—away from his room, away from his toys, away from the things that he loves the most.

Children awaiting their fates at detention centers are victims of crime, violence, and war, and we have a responsibility to address the root causes of their migration. Without a comprehensive solution, however, we will continue to face situations like the crisis that we see now at the southern border.

For over a year now, House Republicans have refused to take up a long overdue overhaul of the immigration system that will streamline the legal immigration process, decrease the Nation's deficit, secure our borders, create jobs, and provide an earned pathway to citizenship.

We need to put politics aside and work together to pass a fair immigration plan for the 21st century that honors this country's history as the land of opportunity, justice, and equality for all.

LIVE LIKE BELLA FOUNDATION FOR CHILDHOOD CANCER

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Live Like Bella Foundation for Childhood Can-

cer, an organization based in my home district of Miami.

Inspired by Bella Rodriguez-Torres, a young girl who courageously fought cancer six times until her death last year, this foundation supports the fight against pediatric cancer, while offering much-needed support for families.

Cancer is the number one cause of death in children under the age of 15. Live Like Bella is dedicated to raising funds for innovative cancer research at Miami Children's Hospital.

During National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month, the foundation will host its first annual Bella's Ball, where Miami will dress up in golden shimmer and shine in memory of Bella and in order to create awareness of childhood cancer.

The event enjoys broad support from Miami celebrities, such as Jon Secada, and athletes like Eddy "The Jet" Alvarez, as well as from many local businesses.

I encourage everyone in our south Florida community to attend this event on Saturday, September 13, which supports a wonderful cause in need of greater public attentiveness.

RAISE THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Mr. ELLISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, an increase in the minimum wage is good for jobs. Minimum wage workers are adults who support families, and exorbitant CEO pay actually has been proven to hurt the performance of companies. Three new studies confirm these three points, and I would like to elaborate a little bit.

Minimum wage workers are older than they used to be. Their average age is 35 years old, and 88 percent are at least 20 years old. Most are women. Women make up 48 percent of the workforce; yet 55 percent of the would-be beneficiaries of an increase to the minimum wage are women.

Raising the minimum wage will not cost jobs. That is a myth. Here are the facts: 13 States raised the minimum wage in 2014, and all but one have seen employment gains. Now, that doesn't prove causation, but it does prove that this claim that minimum wage hurts jobs is false.

It is also the case that we are often told that high pay for CEOs is just a reward and that it incentivizes them to work hard. High CEO pay does not increase profitability.

In fact, in June, a study was published that looked at the long-term performance of 1,500 companies. That is a lot of data. They are finding that higher, exorbitant CEO pay hurts companies. Forbes says, "How could this be? In a word, overconfidence."

The bottom line is that the myths that we live by are not true. Let's raise the wage and get some accountability at the executive level.

WAGING WAR ON COLSTRIP, MONTANA

(Mr. DAINES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, Colstrip, Montana, is a town that runs on coal. Hundreds of hardworking Montanans depend on jobs in Colstrip's coal-fired power plant and its coal mines to provide for their families, but one anticoal energy consultant said that Montanans "should plan for life without Colstrip," due, in part, to job-killing regulations proposed by the Obama administration.

EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy recently met with a group of Democrat Senators who commended the Agency's efforts on these emissions rules.

I urge Administrator McCarthy to get out of Washington, D.C., and speak with the Montana families who will be directly and negatively affected by these regulations and to explain to them why the Obama administration is waging a war on their livelihoods and their town. He is waging a war on the middle class.

NATIONAL OCEAN POLICY

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the National Ocean Policy.

Later today, we may consider an amendment to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill to undermine this important policy. The amendment would promote inefficiency in ocean management. It would harm coastal communities.

We depend on the marine environment for many important uses, like food, tourism, and the transportation of goods. These diverse interests often conflict, which is why the National Ocean Policy provides a forum for local stakeholders and Federal agencies to talk to each other and work things out.

Efforts to cripple the National Ocean Policy will prevent local ocean users from deciding what issues are most important for their local communities, and that makes no sense.

Improving the coordination between Federal agencies and local ocean stakeholders is a bipartisan idea that was first suggested during the Bush administration. It should still have bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to support the National Ocean Policy and to reject efforts to undermine this commonsense idea.

CRISIS AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I stand to address the crisis occurring along

our southern border, which is a direct result of the President's failure to uphold the laws of our Nation.

Illegal aliens apprehended in Texas are being shipped and flown to California, which is my home State, as well as to other States, on the taxpayers' dime. Allegations state that approximately 420 Central American illegal aliens, mostly women and children, were on the first three flights into San Diego.

Flooding our State with these illegal aliens not only creates a humanitarian crisis that must be dealt with, but it crosses a line that the American public will not and should not tolerate.

We cannot continue to stand by and allow this administration to continue to pick and choose what laws will be enforced. These policies have resulted in what we are facing now—unlawful immigration, especially children and their families. They are getting a mixed message and a mixed signal from this administration, that of believing they may receive some form of amnesty from this administration or will at least have a chance to stay in this country, regardless of the laws of our Nation.

Unless this present administration starts upholding the laws of the land and ensuring our border is secure, this crisis will continue to get worse and worse, affecting our children and our economy very detrimentally.

The President's demand—the solution he is proposing—of \$3.7 billion in additional funding isn't a solution at all. It does nothing to address the border problems we have in the enforcement of the border.

We need to find real solutions, and this flood of illegal immigration is just going to be a bigger detriment to our Nation.

PASS EXTENSION OF THE HIGHWAY ACT

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, while we were on break, the 58th anniversary of the interstate highway system was celebrated, and while there is a lot of discussion here in the House about different issues, there is nothing more important for this Congress to do than to create jobs for the American public. The best way to create jobs is to pass an extension of the Highway Act—infrastructure bills.

President Eisenhower was a President who knew we needed a strong infrastructure and a highway system. When he needed a sponsor in the Senate, it was Albert Gore, Sr., from Tennessee—a Democrat—who sponsored that bill.

We need bipartisanship the way we had it with Eisenhower and Gore in order to come up with a highway extension. If it is a gas tax—whatever it is—we need to do it. We need to put Americans back to work, and we need

to put our infrastructure first. Those should be the responsibilities of this House.

I pledge to support transportation efforts to get a bill passed and to make America proud about its infrastructure again—bridges, runways, and roads.

DEPLOY NATIONAL GUARD TO SECURE OUR BORDER

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we have a very sad human tragedy going on at our border, with many thousands of children coming to the U.S. from Central America.

Americans are the most generous, compassionate people in the world, but if we don't secure our borders, we will destroy America as we have known it. There are probably several hundred million people who would come here in a short time, if we simply opened our borders.

We must have a legal, orderly system of immigration, and it must be enforced. Our entire infrastructure—our schools, our hospitals, our jails, our sewers, and so forth—just cannot take in hundreds of millions more people in a short time.

We need to immediately deploy our National Guard to secure our border, and we need to immediately change the laws, so that every unaccompanied child does not require a court hearing.

This is an emergency situation, Mr. Speaker. It does not require more money. It requires immediate action with funds that are already available.

□ 1230

EFFECTS OF AMERICA'S WAR ON DRUGS

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke about the flood of unaccompanied minors crossing our borders to escape drug and gang violence caused by America's war on drugs.

Today I want to speak about the effect of that drug war on young people trapped in the inner cities of America on this side of the border. Take Chicago, for instance: 58 shot, 14 killed over the July Fourth weekend; most involved drugs, if not all.

Politicians cracked down on drug crime in the eighties and nineties, but look at the impact that it has had. It is a failed war on drugs that has become a war on urban youth. Many boys on the streets of Chicago or Atlanta can barely cross the street without bullets streaking past their heads.

The war on drugs and its impact on our youth needs to end now.

NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

(Mr. DUFFY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern for the administration's nuclear negotiations with Iran.

This administration has a questionable track record on diplomacy. Just 3 weeks ago, it put five Taliban commanders back on the battlefield. We are witnessing an unraveling of our hard-fought gains in Iraq because of the administration's inability to negotiate a status of forces agreement before our withdrawal of troops. Syria is in flames; al Qaeda is on the move; the Taliban are resurgent in Afghanistan as we talk about a drawdown. And the list goes on, Mr. Speaker.

The administration has, time and time again, demonstrated terrible judgment when it comes to foreign policy. There are real concerns by experts who have testified in front of the Foreign Affairs Committee that the deal in regard to Iran's nuclear weapons not just leaves the region, but the United States, less safe.

Mr. President, put down the pool cue, pick up the map, find your way to Capitol Hill, and let's work together to make sure we don't have a nuclear Iran.

LET'S BE CLEAR ON IMMIGRATION POLICY

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise out of an overwhelming concern for young people and children in Central America.

President Obama has a habit of saying to Americans, "Let me be clear." I wish desperately he would be clear with the thousands of Central American families who have not yet tried to cross our border.

In 2012, the President announced he would not enforce the law with regard to 800,000 young people who crossed our border illegally. Predictably, families and dangerous smugglers got the message.

Detention centers in our Southwestern States are overflowing. The photos and stories of the traveling and living conditions of these kids is heart-breaking to see and to hear.

Tragically, the administration doubled down on Sunday, when Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson promised more executive action and refused to say new arrivals would be returned. This ambiguous approach created the crisis in the first place. Without clarity, more suffering will assuredly follow.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the President would consider the consequences of his

disregard for the rule of law and be clear with would-be legal immigrants.

FOREST SERVICE GROUNDWATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT DIRECTIVE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently I joined fellow lawmakers in sending a letter to the U.S. Agriculture Secretary concerning the U.S. Forest Service's proposed groundwater resource management directive.

Similar to a large number of other proposals stemming from this administration, the directive seeks to further federalize water resources at the expense of State authority and private property rights. Additionally, it will unnecessarily interfere with State and private water rights, along with other activities.

Furthermore, the directive was proposed without State or local input, which will encourage litigation and potentially interfere with the adjacent State, local, and private land and water rights.

In Pennsylvania's Allegheny National Forest, 93 percent of the subsurface rights are privately owned, which means the consequence of this directive could even be more complicated and threatening to private property and water rights.

Mr. Speaker, the mission of the Forest Service is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the Nation's forests. Unfortunately, this policy will achieve little or no environmental benefit while it, at the same time, undermines the agency's statutory obligation to manage these lands.

The Forest Service should withdraw this ill-timed and punitive directive.

NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF EXCESSIVE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT AUDITS

(Mrs. ELLMERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the excessive audit system that exists for our medical equipment providers that provide essential medical equipment for our seniors across this country. It is negatively affecting them and their businesses. These businesses provide essential services and education to our seniors and Medicare patients.

It is important to point out that this practice was put in place because of the fraud and abuse that existed within the system; but rather than targeting fraudulent practices, they are targeting people playing by the rules and are being punished because of the bad actions of a few of the bad actors.

One example is a business in my community that provides essential health

care to Medicare and senior patients, providing oxygen and hospital beds, which are essential, basic equipment. They have been audited 50 percent of the time.

This is a practice that has to end; and I am introducing legislation tomorrow that will address this issue, reform the system, and get to the point of really addressing the fraudulent practitioners that need the reform.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5016, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4718, BONUS DEPRECIATION MODIFIED AND MADE PERMANENT

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 661 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 661

Resolved, That (a) at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or clause 5(a) of rule XXI are waived except for section 627.

(b) During consideration of the bill for amendment—

(1) each amendment, other than amendments provided for in paragraph (2), shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment except as provided in paragraph (2);

(2) no pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate; and

(3) the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read.

(c) When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4718) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation. All points of order

against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration on two measures: H.R. 5016, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, and H.R. 4718, that would permanently extend the bonus depreciation.

The resolution provides a modified open rule for consideration of H.R. 5016 so that all Members have the opportunity to come to the floor and offer any amendment to the bill that complies with House rules on this important piece of legislation.

The resolution also provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 4718, and provides for 60 minutes of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means. In addition, the rule provides for a motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, a little over 2 months ago, I was pleased to present the House the rule for consideration of the first two appropriations bills. This rule will provide for the consideration of the eighth appropriations bill by the House.

In the Appropriations Committee, we have already reported out 10 of the 12 required appropriations bills and are moving closer to finishing the two remaining bills. Contrast this with the other body, where they have yet to pass even a single appropriations measure.

Mr. Speaker, the Financial Services Appropriations bill maintains the fis-

cal discipline agreed to as part of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 that this country desperately needs. While the President requested an additional \$1.7 billion over fiscal year 2014-enacted levels, this bill actually funds these programs at \$566 million less than last year's level.

In addition, this bill maintains a number of important funding restrictions over the IRS. Given their unconscionable targeting of conservative organizations and their deliberate stonewalling of legitimate inquiries by the Ways and Means and Oversight and Government Reform Committees, these funding prohibitions are necessary and appropriate.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for consideration of H.R. 4718, which permanently extends bonus depreciation. During this extended time of sluggish economic growth, it is important for the Congress to pass legislation that will encourage our job creators to do just that—create jobs.

An analysis by the nonpartisan Tax Foundation found that permanent bonus depreciation would actually grow the economy by 1 percent, adding \$182 billion to the economy; increase the capital stock by over 3 percent; increase wages by about 1 percent; and create 212,000 new jobs.

□ 1245

Since its creation in 2002, this credit has routinely been extended on a bipartisan basis. It is important that we do so again today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman ROGERS for making good on his commitment to ensure orderly and timely consideration of appropriations bills. I also want to commend Chairman CAMP for examining the Tax Code, ensuring we can provide the tax certainty that so many businesses need in order to make investment decisions that benefit us all.

I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we are breaking a record yet again for the most closed Congress ever. The majority has broken their own record for the most closed Congress in history. Again and again, they have wasted time, money, and energy on legislative proposals designed to distract us from the problems at hand. And that certainly is true today.

The American people are hoping that Congress will create jobs, expand educational opportunities, and support working families, but instead, we insist on spending millions of dollars on investigating made-up scandals and adding billions and billions to the deficit.

Today we have one rule for two bills: first, the bonus depreciation bill, and,

second, the Financial Services Appropriations bill, two bills with nothing in common except to highlight the majority's insistence of choosing policy over people.

Now, H.R. 4718 would make bonus depreciation permanent. This is a policy that maybe you have never heard of, but it is a policy that used to be bipartisan and still would be on a 1- or 2-year basis, like the Senate has proposed. It is designed as a temporary measure, and I emphasize "temporary" because if it isn't temporary, it is not effective.

Bonus depreciation gives businesses an extra large immediate tax deduction for a portion of the cost of investments in equipment. Instead of spending more of the deduction over future years, it incentivizes purchasing equipment now in order to provide an immediate boost to the economy, instead of in the future when the incentive may not be available.

And that is how it has always temporarily worked. But if we make it permanent, then the taxpayers are simply subsidizing the cost of the equipment that businesses would need to purchase anyway.

My good friend from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), who is as good a businessman as he is a Congressman—and that is saying a lot—said yesterday that in 2003, his small business went out and bought \$100,000 worth of computers specifically because he could take advantage of the bonus depreciation, which was in place and was a very smart thing for him to have done. And that is exactly how bonus depreciation is supposed to work.

Mr. COLE knew computers would be cheaper at that time than in a year or two, when the tax credit would have expired. So he spent the money on equipment. And that surely helped the economy, and I am sure it created some jobs.

But why would Mr. COLE buy the computers immediately if he knew the tax credit would be there forever? He wouldn't, I don't believe. We will talk about that later.

This tool was put in place between 2002 and 2005, at 30 percent and then at 50 percent. It was reenacted in 2008 and then extended four times, often as part of a larger stimulus package, most recently at 50 percent. That expired at the end of 2013.

Now, when enacted as a temporary measure, there has been bipartisan support. However, the bill we have before us intends to make it permanent, completely negating the purpose of the bonus depreciation as a temporary measure.

The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service looked into the change, and they said, "Its temporary nature is critical to its effectiveness" and that bonus depreciation "was enacted for a specific, short-term purpose."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now insert the Congressional Research Service's report, "Bonus Depreciation: Economic and Budgetary Issues," from March 24, 2014, into the RECORD.

[From Congressional Research Service, Mar. 24, 2014]

BONUS DEPRECIATION: ECONOMIC AND BUDGETARY ISSUES

(By Jane G. Gravelle, Senior Specialist in Economic Policy)

SUMMARY

The Tax Extenders Act of 2013 (S. 1859), which would extend expiring tax provisions for a year, includes bonus depreciation. The temporary provisions enacted in the past for only a year or two and extended multiple times are generally referred to collectively as the "extenders." One reason advanced for these temporary provisions is that time is needed to evaluate them. Most of these provisions, however, have been extended multiple times, and some suggest that these provisions are actually permanent but are extended a year or two at a time because permanent provisions would significantly increase the costs in the budget horizon. Historically, bonus depreciation has not been a traditional "extender."

Bonus depreciation allows half of equipment investment to be deducted immediately rather than depreciated over a period of time. Bonus depreciation was enacted for a specific, short-term purpose: to provide an economic stimulus during the recession. Most stimulus provisions have expired. Bonus depreciation has been in place six years (2008–2013), contrasted with an earlier use of bonus depreciation in place for three years. Is bonus depreciation temporary or permanent? The analysis of bonus depreciation differs for a temporary stimulus provision, compared to a permanent provision that can affect the size and allocation of the capital stock.

A temporary investment subsidy was expected to be more effective than a permanent one for short-term stimulus, encouraging firms to invest while the benefit was in place. Its temporary nature is critical to its effectiveness. Yet, research suggests that bonus depreciation was not very effective, and probably less effective than the tax cuts or spending increases that have now lapsed. If bonus depreciation is made permanent, it increases accelerated depreciation for equipment, contributing to lower, and in some cases more negative, effective tax rates. In contrast, prominent tax reform proposals would reduce accelerated depreciation. Making bonus depreciation a permanent provision would significantly increase its budgetary cost.

Compared to a statutory corporate tax rate of 35%, bonus depreciation lowers the effective tax rate for equipment from an estimated 26% rate to a 15% rate. Buildings are taxed approximately at the statutory rate. Total tax rates would be slightly higher because of stockholder taxes. Because nominal interest is deducted, however, effective tax rates with debt finance can be negative. For equity assets taxed at an effective rate of 35%, the effective tax rate on debt-financed investment is a negative 5%. The rate on equipment without bonus depreciation is minus 19%; with bonus depreciation it is minus 37%.

If bonus depreciation is permanent, estimates of U.S. effective tax rates reflecting concerns that the U.S. rate is higher than that of other countries overstate the effective U.S. corporate tax rate; U.S. effective tax rates on equipment would be significantly lower than the OECD average.

Moving to permanent bonus depreciation is inconsistent with tax reform proposals made

by the Wyden-Coats bill, the Senate Finance Committee Staff discussion draft, and Chairman Camp's proposal. All of these proposals would reduce the current accelerated depreciation for equipment.

The usual extenders cost a fraction of the cost of permanent provisions in a 10-year budget window, but bonus depreciation is a smaller fraction because it is a timing provision. A one-year extension costs \$5 billion for FY2014–FY2024, less than 2% of the cost of \$263 billion for a permanent provision.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. What the majority is fond of saying is that this bill would bring in \$10 billion in revenue. And I heard it over and over again at the Rules Committee last night, that we are going to have \$10 billion in revenue. But what they fail to say is that over 10 years, it is going to cost us \$287 billion, nearly \$300 billion, which could buy us a lot of high-speed rail, a lot of bridge infrastructure, a lot of highway work. But what we are now doing is a permanent subsidy to make tax cuts to every business that wants to buy equipment.

Now, the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation scored this at \$287 billion over 10 years. We are not making that up. The majority is cobbling together a piecemeal approach, and it will not work. We would love to have tax reform, we cry out for tax reform, but this isn't it.

To cap it all off, this is another closed rule. And let me say what that means. Even if a Member wanted to offer an amendment to pay for the nearly \$300 billion cost of this bill—which is the rules under which we operate, you know, PAYGO—they wouldn't be allowed.

There are so many better things to spend that \$300 billion on, the things that we really need in this country. But the closed rule ensures that it would stifle the debate and hijack the process. And, more than that, we know the Senate will not take this up.

So, once again, we are doing a bill that might make some people feel good but not if they think about it a little bit. Because even the businesses who are going to be prospering from the tax decrease are going to be responsible for the loss of \$300 billion.

So with the second bill, which is H.R. 5016, the Financial Services Appropriations, the majority is cherry-picking which agencies to fund and which to strangle for purely political purposes. They will continue chasing down the all-but-defunct IRS conspiracy rabbit, getting funding for the IRS but making it so that \$2 billion worth of the tax revenue will not be collected because they have cut the budget of the IRS so much. So add that \$2 billion to the \$300 billion that we are voting on today for depreciation, and add that onto the deficit, too, since it is not paid for.

In addition, as the majority crisscrosses the country touting states' rights, they have also put forward legislation that obstructs, once again, the District of Columbia's home rule by restricting funding for constitutionally protected medical care. The majority

insists on ensuring that women are second-class citizens, and they continue to chip away at our constitutional rights.

Furthermore, this bill continues to prevent multi-State policies under the Affordable Care Act from providing coverage for abortions under the Federal Employees Health Benefits program, except in the most desperate of circumstances.

We need to say over and over again that, of the women in this country who are using birth control, 58 percent—more than half of them—are using it for medical reasons. And they are being deprived. Mr. Speaker, 58 percent of the women in this country who are using prescription contraception are using it because they have medical issues, and it is expensive. But we will not let them get any help because we simply don't believe in providing health care for women.

Government workers deserve the same benefits and the same access to comprehensive health care as those in the private sector enjoy. It is, in fact, dangerous for the majority to target abortion care and require its exclusion from health insurance plans that include other important and necessary reproductive health services. Women expect and deserve the best health care and coverage that fits their needs.

And let's remember that 58 percent of the women who use oral contraceptives use them for medical purposes, not just for birth control.

I would like to be able to say that women should expect their government to be able to put their health and safety above election-year politics, but this is what we have come to expect here. Women deserve better. But I am afraid in the House, women's rights, again, continue to be undermined. Time and again, we have prioritized in this House—some of us—politics over people.

Let me mention the veterans, for example. Listen to this. This is really important to know. While those veterans who have served and sacrificed for our country are waiting months in line for medical care, the House majority will spend more money investigating and trying to debunk a nonexistent Benghazi scandal than helping our veterans get the care they need. That is right. The committee investigating Benghazi has a much larger budget than the Veterans' Affairs Committee. If that is not a political statement, I don't know what is.

And I need to point out that just yesterday, transcripts from the Armed Services Committee about Benghazi proved that everything that could have been done was done.

And I know that when I last did the rule on the floor on the special Benghazi committee that I received a call from the mother of one of the Navy SEALs that died, saying that she really wished the Congress would stop dragging their family back through that horror. They know what happened.

Instead of working on the real problems—and we have got them—they are finding time to sue the President for doing his job, to hold vote after vote to repeal ObamaCare. And let's remember the shutdown of the government that took \$24 billion in that short time out of this economy.

So we come here to make things better. And with these actions and with this behavior, we make things worse.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As usual, my friend is a sharp and acute debater and makes points over a broad number of issues.

I do want to say, for the record, I am not such a great businessman, but I have a great business partner who has been my partner for 25 years. She is the managing partner. She made the call. And I have been very fortunate to be friends and partners with her for many, many years.

I think she probably moved as quickly as she did because she didn't think the government would have the good sense to keep this open. But the fact is, under both Republicans and Democrats, we have done bonus depreciation. When my friends were in the majority, they continued to routinely extend it themselves.

And after more than a decade, it has become, frankly, pretty much a permanent feature of our Tax Code. Now it is not so permanent that you can absolutely rely on it in the business sense. But I still accept the argument, after something that has been repeatedly confirmed by both sides, and both sides have repeatedly extended it and made it effectively permanent, we ought to go ahead and provide business with that certainty. Again, we will have a debate on that, and that is appropriate.

The second point I want to discuss, where I do differ with my friend a little bit: look, we always quibble no matter who is in the majority over how open the process is and how much the minority is allowed to participate in it. When we do that, we usually need to remember, if we are in the minority, what our record was when we were in the majority.

I want to remind my friends on the other side that throughout the 111th Congress, the final 2 years of their time in the majority, the House never considered a single bill under an open rule. That is the definition of a closed process. On the contrary, under Republican control, the House has returned to the consideration of appropriations bills under an open process, with 22 open rules.

Again, I was on the Appropriations Committee when my friends took the opportunity that every Member enjoys, to come down and participate in the appropriations process, away from everyone—their side and our side alike.

Additionally, the Congress has allowed under our control more than

1,000 amendments to be offered on the House floor, including a total of 488 amendments offered by Democrats and another 137 bipartisan amendments. Forty percent of all submitted amendments have been made in order. Compare that to our friends, who made only 17 percent in order under their majority regime in the 111th Congress.

So when you actually compare the record of the Republican majority to the most recent Democratic majority, any fair analysis would show that Republicans are running a far more open and transparent House. I think that is something that my friends need to recall when they raise this particular critique.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank my good friend from New York for yielding and for her work on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, A Congress controlled by Members trying to reduce the Federal footprint at every turn ought to be the first to reject two amendments in the Financial Services appropriation, which fly in the face of their own core philosophy.

First is the abortion amendment that would keep the District of Columbia from spending its own local funds on abortions for low-income women.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, 17 States that are represented in this House spend their own local funds in this way, and we are determined to fight until the district's low-income women have the same reproductive health rights as the women who live in those 17 States.

There is a second bill—a second amendment that targets the District of Columbia and its marijuana decriminalization law at the same time that the States are rapidly moving in the same direction.

Eighteen of them, before the District even got there, have decriminalized marijuana. Two States have legalized marijuana, 23 States have legalized medical marijuana, and a recent Pew Research poll found that more than half of the American people support marijuana legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment that targets the District of Columbia is authored by Representative ANDY HARRIS of Maryland. Maryland is one of the States that has decriminalized marijuana.

Now, he couldn't convince his own State, where the voters are accountable to him, not to decriminalize marijuana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. I appreciate the generosity of the ranking member.

He wants to come to this floor and try to convince this body, where not a single Member is accountable to the residents of the District of Columbia, that it should not allow the District to decriminalize its marijuana laws. I don't know why the Members from those 18 States have decriminalized, but let me tell you why they were decriminalized in the District of Columbia. They were decriminalized for racial justice reasons. We discovered, through a scientific study, that African Americans were eight times more likely to be arrested for marijuana possession than Whites, even though Whites and Blacks in the District of Columbia and in the United States of America use marijuana at the same rate.

Forty years ago, this Congress passed the Home Rule Act leaving local matters to the District of Columbia, just like your local matters are left home. We demand the same respect for local control for the District of Columbia residents who are full American citizens, like everybody else who represents people on this floor.

We demand that our American citizens have the same respect for their local control that on this floor, that every day, you demand for your own residents.

I thank the ranking member.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have enormous respect for my friend from the District of Columbia. She does a tremendous job representing her community, and she is an articulate and able Member of this body. It is true. We do have an unusual degree of authority as Congress over the Capital of the United States. That is a constitutional issue and an article I, section 8 issue.

Being the Capital brings great privileges and benefits to Washington, but it also, unquestionably, at times, brings some difficulties and some strains as well; so we all—whoever is in the majority—try to manage that as best they can.

In terms of the abortion issue, the language in this bill that applies to D.C., as I understand it, has been pretty routine under both Democrats and Republicans over the years, and so that is my understanding of that issue.

On the marijuana issue, the Federal prohibition here has existed for many years and was actually proposed in the President's budget. The amendment that was offered and adopted in the committee—and there was a very spirited debate about this by Dr. HARRIS—does add new language to prohibit local funds for recreational use of marijuana. The intent is to prevent D.C. from legalizing marijuana for recreational use.

D.C. has enacted a law which makes possession of small amounts of marijuana a civil offense, carrying a \$25 fine, and that goes into effect later this month.

In November, D.C. may have a ballot initiative to legalize possession of

small amounts. I suspect this will be an ongoing discussion and concern between the Congress and the community.

Ms. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generosity of the gentleman for yielding.

First, let me set straight that the District of Columbia gets not one single benefit that any other Member who pays taxes—except we pay taxes without representation—not one single benefit that is any different from what other members get.

Secondly, on marijuana decriminalization, I respect the differences we have there, and the States are experimenting now. The District has only decriminalized marijuana, and recently, a member of the council introduced an amendment—which I bet you the other 18 States have not done—to educate our young people about marijuana, so that they don't go off and try it.

Nobody is for smoking marijuana—I wish we hadn't smoked all those cigarettes, there would be millions of people alive if we hadn't—but we really don't want to see people go to jail for possessing marijuana, and we don't want to live in a city where the only people who get arrested for possessing marijuana are people who look like me.

This is a city full of college students. They don't get arrested. Those who get arrested are African Americans because the police patrol those areas more sternly than others. We are asking for racial justice, but above all, we are asking for local control.

I want to say one thing about your citing of the Constitution. You are absolutely right. The Constitution gives the Congress control, but Congress passed, 40 years ago, the Home Rule Act, and that Home Rule Act was Congress' understanding that there ought to be no Members of this House who don't have total control over their own local money and over their own local affairs.

We ask for the same respect, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman for the points that she made. I would just say that, again, this is going to be an ongoing source of tension—it has been.

To clarify, when I said the Capital benefits, I meant to imply in no way that citizens here don't have the same obligations, same responsibilities, and bear the same burdens. I happen to have two wonderful military bases in my facility. We think we are privileged to host them. We derive considerable benefit and employment from their presence.

I will note, just as the gentlewoman suggests, we pay taxes, too. We are American citizens, and those weren't put there for our benefit. They were put there for the purposes of defending the country, but we are happy to have them.

I suggest there is probably a lot of that same pride in this community for hosting the Capital of the United States, so that was my intent in that remark.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. May I inquire if my friend has any more requests for time?

Mr. COLE. I do not.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. We are going to call for the previous question, Mr. Speaker, and if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the legislation that would treat wildfires like similar major natural disasters and ensure that money intended for managing public lands is actually used for that purpose.

It is time to make commonsense changes in the Federal wildfire budget.

Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal on wildfires, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank my good friend for yielding that time.

Mr. Speaker, sometime in the end of July or, at the latest, very early August, the inadequate budget for forest firefighting for the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service will be exhausted—that's right, exhausted.

We are going to be at a point where there will be fires raging across the West. We are looking at record drought, record dry fuels, and you will be able, probably, to smell or see the smoke across a lot of the country.

Mr. Speaker, we should be doing everything we can to prepare for this and prevent this in the future, and that is the crux of this argument. We are not going to stop fighting fires. They can't because the forests will burn and people will die. No, we are going to stop it, but they will borrow from and decimate every other account in their budgets.

Forty percent of the Forest Service budget goes to fighting fires on an annual basis, which means every year we repeat this little Groundhog Day thing. They have to suspend the programs that would prevent future forest fires—that is fuel reduction programs, forest health programs.

They have to cut into the recreation budget and all of the other activities and things that they must do—cut into their timber management program, everything gets decimated—and the money just goes to fight fires.

We have the rarest of rare things here: a bicameral, bipartisan bill that is supported by the President of the United States. What else in this town is bipartisan, bicameral, and supported by the President?

Mr. Speaker, this should be a no-brainer. I have asked for hearings in the committee on the coming catastrophe this summer. No hearings have been held. We have legislation with 100

cosponsors—no action, no hearing, and no action on that bill.

We need this funding this month, and that way, the Forest Service won't have to decimate the programs that would prevent or mitigate future forest fires. So, come on, guys, let's wake up, smell the smoke, and do what is right and needs to be done—an adequate budget to fight the catastrophic forest fires across the Western United States.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, San Diego and the entire State of California are facing a prolonged drought that is placing us at increased risk for wildfires. We are currently in the midst of what is expected to be one of the longest and hardest wildfire seasons in recent memory.

That is why I also agree that we have to take action immediately to ensure adequate funding for wildfires by bringing to the floor H.R. 3992, the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act of 2014.

It is a bipartisan bill with dozens of sponsors from both sides of the aisle. It is fiscally responsible and has broad support from Washington and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, in May, San Diego saw an early start to fire season, when nearly a dozen wildfires erupted over a 5-day period, burning 27,000 acres and destroying 65 homes. Every day, communities in the region are at risk of wildfires.

This is an elongated fire season. We are not used to seeing these kinds of events in San Diego until September or October. That means that the cost to contain fires and the damage they cause will increase, and it makes it vital that we provide sufficient funds for officials to respond to them.

So we need to make the existing disaster contingency fund open to cover part of the cost of wildfire response. I have seen the impact of catastrophic wildfires firsthand. It is clear to me that wildfires should be treated the same as other natural disasters like hurricanes or tornadoes or Superstorm Sandy.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we change the law in this way on which there is an agreement, so that natural disasters include wildfires and allow our States and localities to access the necessary funds, without forcing us to choose between disaster relief and disaster prevention, which is a silly budget policy, but the one we are following today.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and amend the rule, so we can bring up H.R. 3992, the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act of 2014. We can bring it to the floor for a vote today.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by agreeing with the last two speakers, in terms of the substance of their argument. I happen to be a cosponsor of that legislation, which is proposed by

my good friend, Mr. SIMPSON, and I think they are discussing a very real and very important issue, and this is an issue where there is considerable bipartisan agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I probably will end up opposing the manner in which you are going to try and bring this to the floor, but I do think it needs to come to the floor. There is an orderly process to do that. There are discussions underway to continue to work on it; but, again, my friend makes a very good point.

I have tried consistently during my tenure here, no matter who is in control, to recognize that, when we have disasters, that people who are dealing with them need immediate help, and you need to vote accordingly and try and make that occur.

□ 1315

I sit on the Interior Subcommittee where we wrestle with this funding issue that both of my friends brought up, and they are precisely right. Since you can't predict a fire, you can't produce the amount, we end up treating fires differently than every other kind of disaster and we savage the normal budget process and actually drain a lot of accounts, accounts that in some cases would help us prevent future fires by helping us get rid of hazard fuel buildup in forests and things of that nature.

Again, I think my friends make a good point. I think we are going to continue to work on this in a bipartisan manner. I hope we will get there.

I will note for the RECORD that when we were actually considering the Republican budget, we were engaged on that committee, which I sit on as a representative from Appropriations, in discussions with one of our Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle about bringing an amendment and actually writing it in the budget. We had Republicans prepared at that point to vote for that amendment in sufficient numbers. The White House, I was told, was actually in favor of doing that. For whatever reason, the decision was made not to do that. Again, I cast no aspersions here, but I think we probably missed a more appropriate opportunity of actually cementing it down.

But I will say this: both of my friends have my commitment to continue to try and work with them and find an appropriate vehicle and appropriate time to get this done. I appreciate very, very much the fact that you came to the floor and brought it up and reminded us of how significant an issue this is. This is something we should be able to work across the aisle and accomplish. I thank my friend.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague is prepared to close, I will close.

Mr. COLE. I am prepared to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the majority continues to choose politics over people, create

problems instead of solving them, and insist on silencing debate in the Chamber. It is time to consider the real problems facing the country, and with summer comes the destructive fire season that affects so many of my colleagues' districts.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and move to consider the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act to make the commonsense changes in the Federal wildfire budget.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, and vote "no" on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to say that one of the basic functions of Congress is to actually fund the government. This rule would continue that process for consideration of appropriations bills for fiscal year 2015. In addition, it would allow for consideration of legislation that makes bonuses depreciation permanent, a provision that has existed as part of our Tax Code under both Democrats and Republicans since 2002.

I have enjoyed the debate. As always, I appreciate exchanging views with my good friend from New York, by way of Kentucky, two States blessed, and I would urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 661 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3992) to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except

one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3992.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 10, 2014 at 10:45 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 247.
That the Senate passed S. 311.
That the Senate passed S. 354.
That the Senate passed S. 363.
That the Senate passed S. 476.
That the Senate passed S. 609.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 255.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 330.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 507.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 697.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 876.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1158.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3110.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2337.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 272.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1216.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 356.
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 291.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 4923, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASSIDY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 641 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4923.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1320

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 9, 2014, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 14 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) had been postponed, and the bill had been read through page 59, line 20.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call up amendment No. 16.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 508. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 3112(d)(2)(B) of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h-10(d)(2)(B)) and all public notice and comment requirements under chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code, that are applicable to carrying out such section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentlewoman from Wyoming and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reinforce the Department of Energy's already existing legal obligations when it sells or transfers excess uranium from the Federal inventory.

One of these legal obligations is called the "Secretarial Determination" that the uranium transfers will not have an adverse material impact on the

domestic uranium industry. The other obligation is to comply with the public notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

The Department's actions regarding uranium have come under justified scrutiny, so I will take both of them in turn.

First, my amendment reinforces the required Secretarial Determination that uranium transfers do not adversely impact the domestic uranium industries.

Congress decided to require a Secretarial Determination because, if the government dumps too much uranium onto the market, it can artificially distort the market and hurt domestic uranium industries. These include uranium mining, uranium conversion, and uranium enrichment industries, all crucial to developing a more robust domestic uranium supply chain to feed our nuclear power plants.

Right now, 90 percent of the uranium used to provide electricity in this country is imported, but it doesn't have to be that way. Here in the United States, including my home State of Wyoming, we have abundant uranium resources. With uranium from American soil and through American jobs, we can correct this imbalance; but the task is made difficult, if not impossible, with the Department of Energy's cavalier uranium transfers.

The Secretarial Determination process has, unfortunately, become a sham. Instead of protecting domestic uranium industries, it has become a tool to destroy them. Prior to the May 15, 2014, Secretarial Determination, the Department commissioned a market analysis that concluded the uranium transfers would reduce employment in the domestic uranium industries by 4 percent and reduce the spot price for mined uranium by 8 percent. That is what their own market analysis provided. Yet the Department is ignoring the results of its own study and is proceeding anyway, based on other information and analysis it decided not to share with the public.

My amendment uses the power of the purse to reinforce existing statutory law, lest the Department flaunt the law, rendering it meaningless.

Second, my amendment reinforces the Department's obligation to comply with the public notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act. The Department of Energy has used its excess uranium as a slush fund, selling or bartering uranium to subsidize failed companies like the U.S. Enrichment Corporation or to fund other programs without having to come to Congress for the money. This program has operated in the shadows, making a mockery of our budget process.

I want to quote a recent GAO report on the Department's uranium transfers. It says:

We believe transparency is a fundamental tenet of good government and that our recommendations support actions needed to enhance DOE's transparency.

The GAO identified uranium transfers at below market value to prop up USEC, shortchanging the taxpayer and further distorting uranium markets. The report documented shortcomings in the Department's market analysis of how the transfers would impact uranium markets and the failure of the Department to adequately consult with the domestic industries. Unfortunately, on GAO's Web site, all of their recommendations to the Department to increase the transparency of its uranium transfers remained unfulfilled.

My amendment simply reinforces the existing obligation of the Department to comply with the Administrative Procedure Act. Like any other agency, they have a legal obligation to engage in reasoned decisionmaking, not shadowed and arbitrary uranium transactions.

My amendment barely touches the legislative reforms needed to fix this broken program, but I want to thank Chairman SIMPSON for helping me at least identify a way to address this issue that might be suitable to the appropriations process.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The Acting CHAIR. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentlelady's amendment.

For years, our subcommittee has criticized the Department of Energy's use of its uranium transfer authorities. The Department's reliance on its uranium transfers to generate funds for cleanup has inappropriately circumvented the appropriations process, has adversely impacted our domestic uranium mining and conversion industry, and is now creating instability of funding at Portsmouth as the market price of uranium continues to drop.

The amendment restates current law but sends a message to the Department that it must cease relying on these off-budget measures, and I am pleased to support the gentlewoman's amendment and thank her for it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into any

contract with an incorporated entity if such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands, and such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity was previously incorporated in the United States.

Ms. DELAURO (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentlewoman from Connecticut and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

My amendment would prohibit Federal contracts issued by agencies under the jurisdiction of this bill from going to entities incorporated in Bermuda and the Cayman Islands, the two nations most often abused as tax havens.

This body has accepted similar provisions for the Departments of Defense, Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development. As before, we should not spend taxpayer money on Federal contracts that go to companies that have renounced their American citizenship in favor of an island tax haven.

Just this week, Business Week wrote an article examining the loopholes that longstanding American companies like Ingersoll Rand, which was founded in Connecticut in 1871, have been exploiting in order to enjoy lucrative government contracts while pretending to reside overseas for tax purposes.

□ 1330

These firms simply should not be allowed to pretend they are an American company when it comes time to get contracts, then claim to be an offshore company when the tax bill arrives.

According to a recent study, 70 percent of Fortune 500 companies used tax havens last year. They stashed nearly \$2 trillion offshore for tax purposes, nearly two-thirds of which was hidden away by just 30 firms.

Of the companies who have established subsidies and tax havens, nearly two-thirds have registered at least one in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands. The profits these companies claim were earned in these two island nations in 2010 total over 1,600 percent of the country's entire yearly economic output.

These companies take advantage of our education system, our research and development incentives, our skilled workforce, and our infrastructure, all supported by U.S. taxpayers.

We have already acted on the Transportation-HUD bill and Defense. Let us do the same for Energy and Water. Let's support the firms that are staying at home and meeting their obligations and pass this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment.

The Financial Services Appropriations bill has carried language for years which prohibits funding for any Federal Government contract with foreign incorporated entities which are treated as inverted domestic corporations. This language has been carried annually in the government-wide General Provisions section of the Financial Services Appropriations bill since approximately 2005 and is requested annually by the current administration.

The changes which this amendment would propose to make could have significant consequences and really should be handled by the proper tax committees.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, "The ranks of Federal contractors with foreign addresses"—and I am quoting from an article that appeared in Bloomberg this week—"The ranks of Federal contractors with foreign addresses are likely to grow this year as a new stampede of companies escapes the U.S. tax system." Escapes the U.S. tax system.

These are companies who are taking their funds, bringing them to Ireland, to the Caymans, to Bermuda because they do not want to pay their fair share of taxes in the United States of America. There isn't a citizen who can get away with that, but we are allowing these companies to do it. And not only that—because it is legal under our Tax Code which has to be reformed, but my God, that is going to take a month of Sundays to get done—in the meantime, they are collecting millions and millions of dollars in Federal contracts.

We are rewarding these ardent corporations who renounce their U.S. citizenship. They go offshore, take their money offshore, and don't pay taxes so that we can do anything about education or biomedical research or any other areas that we have had to cut the budget on so that they can save their money and not pay any taxes. Then we say: Okay, the floodgates are open; come and get a Federal contract. It is wrong and we shouldn't do that.

Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague. I have been pleased to join her in adding the language of this type to each appropriation bill that has thus far been approved in the House.

I am surprised that there could be any opposition to it today because all this amendment is saying is, if you renounce your citizenship and go abroad to avoid paying taxes, don't come with hand outstretched to ask the other taxpayers who stayed here and worked in America and who are proud to be American businesses and are paying their fair share, don't ask them to put their tax dollars into providing you a government contract.

It seems to me very apparent that some corporations are willing to do their fair share in paying for American security, energy and water projects, and other vital government services and some are not. There are a string of corporations who have decided they would keep their business operations in America, but they would suddenly renounce their American citizenship and become a citizen of one of these island kingdoms. That is not the American approach of fairness in paying for the services that we need.

This amendment would put an end to that renunciation of citizenship and asking for taxpayer-funded business. It is equitable; it is fair. We cannot have the resources that we need to remain the greatest Nation in the world without having every American citizen contributing their fair share. Most are. Those who renounce their citizenship and nominally declare that they are now a foreign citizen and not subject to full American taxation, they are not carrying their fair share.

I urge adoption of this amendment, an equitable amendment, for fairness in our public policy.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the prevailing wage requirements in subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Iowa and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that strikes the

funds that might be used to enforce the Davis-Bacon wage scale. That is a piece of legislation that passed here in this Congress sometime about 1931. It was designed to keep African Americans out of the labor force in New York as they were building Federal buildings. It is a remnant of the Jim Crow law. In fact, it is the only remnant that remains, as near as I believe, of the Jim Crow law.

So it comes down to this. When you have a relationship between two people and they agree to a wage scale, that is all that should be required here. Instead, this Federal minimum wage scale sets a union scale. It is not prevailing wage; it is union scale.

I have dealt with Davis-Bacon wage scales all of my business life. I started a construction company in 1975. We almost immediately had to deal with the Federal Government coming in and saying, on this side of the road you shall pay your shovel operator this, and on the other side of the road you shall pay him something that might be half again more than that, and the guy that runs the grease gun gets this, and the one that runs the excavator gets that. The Federal Government micro-managing and disrupting the efficiencies in our construction companies results in far higher costs for our construction projects.

We have maintained a series of records over the years what it costs additional when we are doing Davis-Bacon federally mandated union scale jobs, and it runs between 8 and 35 percent in our company over these years. There is other data out there that is done—Beacon Hill has some—that shows a range, but in the end it boils down to a net effect of a 20 percent additional cost for a Davis-Bacon wage scale.

Here we are bleeding red ink in the Federal Government. CBO made a recommendation, if we wanted to move towards balance, the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act would be one of those things that would help us move in that direction. But on this bill itself, it appropriates \$5.493 billion for Civil Works programs. All of that would fall under the Davis-Bacon-mandated wage scale. And in title II, the Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation appropriates \$1.014 billion. So the total in this bill is \$6.507 billion. If my amendment is enacted into law, we are going to see a savings in this bill of \$1.3 billion.

Mr. Chairman, no one can claim to be a fiscal conservative if they think the Federal Government needs to inflate the cost of wages. Supply and demand sets the cost of those wages. A reasonable pay scale is arrived at.

I am hearing people say we must bring in tens of millions of people to do the work Americans won't do and pay them a mandated union scale. This is not settled by the prevailing wage. Somebody will get up and say, no, it is a prevailing wage. They take a survey from contractors and find out what the

prevailing wage is; then they work that out, and a board makes a determination on what is actually the prevailing wage.

It is simply not true in practice, Mr. Chairman. It is not true in practice. In practice, some advisers sit down and they decide whether people in different categories ought to have more money next year or not. It is an arbitrary, subjective decision. It is not prevailing wage.

I know this law. I have been with this for a long time. I know that it costs taxpayers a lot of money. I don't think that there is any way to actually find out how hard this number is. I tell you, it is 8 to 35 percent. Beacon Hill has a different number of around 5 to 38. Mine is 8 to 35. I think theirs is 5 to 38 percent. But it averages out to about 20 percent, and that does not include the inefficiencies that are wired into this.

The inefficiencies come when you have labor that is competing for the highest paying jobs and doing sometimes the most inefficient thing with the most inefficient machine because it pays the most money. It is a Jim Crow law. It needs to be eradicated. It was designed to lock African Americans out of the construction trades, particularly in New York, and now it is a Holy Grail for union wages.

I used to say for the gentleman in Massachusetts who was here at the time, when he would say any time there is a relationship between two or more consenting adults the Federal Government should not stick their nose into it, I would say I agree with that. There is no reason why I shouldn't be able to climb into my son's excavator and let him pay me \$10 an hour, whatever we agree to, or \$15 or \$20, not the mandated wage scale.

So I urge adoption of my amendment that would eliminate the enforcement of the Davis-Bacon wage scale on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the King amendment.

What is interesting to me is that the net effect of the King amendment would be to drive wages down, another Republican amendment to not really show any respect for the workers of this country. Are they all going to work for poverty wages?

Millions of our citizens still remain out of work, the middle class is shrinking, and here we have a Member that stands up and he wants to have lower wages. The public wants Congress to create middle class jobs and to pay people what they are worth.

The interesting thing about this amendment is that, when you look back at all the studies that have been done, for instance, when President Bush suspended Davis-Bacon wages during the Hurricane Katrina rebuilding efforts, construction costs went up

due to the dramatic increase in the employment of unqualified workers.

I would like to say to the gentleman—and I know you are a handyman because you have told me you are—that the people who work on these projects are ironworkers. I defy anybody in this place to do that. I think STEPHEN LYNCH did that work. Congressman LYNCH is about the only one that survived that. Boilermakers, carpenters, operating engineers, electricians, laborers, sheet metal workers, cement masons, roofers, painters, these people go up on those high bridges and they risk their lives. They need training. And do you know what? They deserve the wage they get under contract—under contract—not by happenstance, not by accident.

I find it interesting that the gentleman offers this amendment, because in your district, since 1995, you have received \$9 billion in Federal subsidy that goes to your farmers. I don't see the gentleman railing against the subsidies that come to your district. You get insurance. Your farmers get insurance if they lose their crop. What does an ironworker get if he falls off high scaffolding in New York City or Toledo, Ohio, or Cleveland or wherever? What does that worker get?

It is interesting—I think the gentleman is kind of disingenuous—your State ranks second in the Nation for agriculture subsidies. The Federal Government holds you up. Davis-Bacon simply says that, when you go to work, the price of what you are paid, your labor, is by contract; it is not by happenstance; it is not by accident; it is not by exploitation. In fact, we know when better buildings are built, when safe bridges are built, there are no washouts under tunnels and bridges. That is a good thing. That is a good thing for America.

So I hold respect for the workers who want to work, who receive the training to work, who know how difficult the work is.

I will tell you a story from my own district. We built one of the biggest bridges in Ohio several years back. We lost ironworkers and an operating engineer in that process, though we had signed every kind of safety agreement we could possibly sign. And do you know what happened? The construction company decided, because there were at least two lanes, they would pit sets of workers against one another to see who could finish the job fast enough. What happened was some of the cranes were not secured at the base as they hung above the river. The construction company, which was supposed to be abiding by the law and all the safety standards, found a trick in order to save a couple of pennies, and it cost the lives of some of the finest workers in the country.

□ 1345

I devoted months and months and months to making sure that there were good safety standards in place. And they always find a way around it.

This is dangerous work. This is work that most people in this Chamber most likely never thought about, never did; don't understand what these workers go through in cold winter months, hanging above oil rigs across this country; handling public projects underground, above ground, above water.

It is unbelievable what these people do. They go to other countries. Look at the dangerous scaffolding that exists in places like Ukraine, and you respect the trades of this country, who have managed to build apprenticeship and training programs so we don't lose lives needlessly.

Davis-Bacon assures we have a middle class standard; that we have labor valued by contract, not by accident, not by happenstance, not by subsidy, like the gentleman's district gets, but by plain hard work.

I couldn't be more in opposition to any amendment offered this afternoon, and I think the gentleman must be misguided in what he is trying to do here. But I think it is important to have definable standards.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would ask Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 4712 of title 41, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentlewoman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I think we can all agree that we want the workers at our nuclear facilities to be proactive in reporting health and safety violations. It seems pretty obvious.

In California, whistleblowers were key in pointing out critical safety problems at the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station. Had these brave whistleblowers not come forward, we could have had a Fukushima-like meltdown right next to the Marine Corps Base at Camp Pendleton and within 50 miles of 8 million Americans. We need more whistleblowers, not less.

That is why I was flabbergasted to learn that the Department of Energy has allowed its contractors to force their employees to sign agreements not to disclose waste, fraud, or abuse. The DOE's allowance of nondisclosure agreements has been the subject of ongoing congressional investigations, which found that whistleblowers at the Hanford plutonium processing plant in Washington State were fired after raising safety concerns. Not only does this violate basic principles of workplace safety, but it circumvents Congress' constitutional duty to conduct oversight over governmental activities.

This is a part of pattern of abuse by contractors using employment contracts to hide outrageous crimes within their organizations.

In 2005, an employee of a contracting company deployed to Iraq was gang-raped by her coworkers and was then prevented from going to court because her employment contract said that sexual assault allegations would only be heard in private arbitration.

Another contract worker in Iraq reported \$80 million in fraud by the major defense contractor that employed him and was terminated for blowing the whistle. The employer used the excuse that the employee had missed a conference.

Shockingly, the Department of Energy is actually subsidizing this type of illegal and unethical activity with taxpayer money. In many instances, DOE is picking up the legal tabs for these contractors, funding long legal battles against the very whistleblowers who have bravely come forward to protect public health and safety.

The DOE told me just this week that they have no intention of stopping these subsidies, and that they would only seek reimbursement from the contractors if the whistleblower won in court.

My amendment is simple. It makes clear that the Department of Energy must protect non-Federal employees from whistleblower retaliation. It is the workers on the front lines who are best suited to identify and expose misconduct, but contract workers are the most vulnerable to termination.

The risk of career-ending retaliation is currently too great for most non-Federal employees to blow the whistle on their employer or contract manager.

The DOE must stop allowing its contractors to stifle whistleblowers through illegal workplace secrecy agreements and taxpayer-funded lawsuits.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SPEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. We would be happy to accept the gentlewoman's amendment.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 508. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prepare, propose, or promulgate any regulation or guidance that references or relies on the analysis contained in "Technical Support Document: - Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis - Under Executive Order 12866" issued by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government (February 2010), "Technical Support Document: - Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis - Under Executive Order 12866" issued by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government (May 2013), "Technical Support Document - Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis - Under Executive Order 12866" issued by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government (revised November 2013), or "Technical Support Document - Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis - Under Executive Order No. 12866", published at 78 Fed Reg. 228 (November 26, 2013).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Oklahoma and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, in 2010, the administration put together a working group to monetize the cost per ton of carbon emissions for use in cost-benefit analyses for rulemaking undertaken by all agencies in the Federal Government, and then reconvened this group again in 2013 to further increase what they called the "social cost of carbon." They increased that amount by 50 percent in just 3 years.

The process was done behind closed doors and without any public input. The administration refuses to release how much of their deliberations were done in public, how much were done in private, or any of the details of their deliberations. They refuse to release the way they used the scientific modeling or even who actually did the modeling for them, or even something as basic as the list of participants at the meeting—even when it was discussed.

Months after releasing the report—and only after sustained pressure—the administration relented, put the document and the numbers up for public comment, a procedure that is routine for the rulemaking process. But the administration has continued to use the calculations that they said they set aside. They use those calculations for the recent EPA rules decreasing emissions by 30 percent for existing power plants by 2030.

My amendment would prevent the Department of Energy from doing the same thing. This is a rule that has been set aside. It is a number that has not

been agreed to and there was no public comment for. They cannot change a regulatory number without any notice and comment and without any public input. This would prevent them from doing that.

The DOE rulemakings using the social cost of carbon have the potential to raise the cost for everyday activities and purchases for all Americans.

I would ask that this group join me in supporting the amendment, which would prohibit the flawed and capricious social cost of carbon rule from being implemented by the Department of Energy.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment tells the Department of Energy to deny the latest climate change science.

The amendment denies that carbon pollution is harmful and, according to this amendment, the cost of carbon pollution is zero. That is science denial at its worst.

You don't have to look too far to discover the damage already caused by climate change. In fact, in the State that I live in, what used to be Tennessee's ecosystem and climate zone is no more. It has been moved up. If you plant any seed in the ground, you look at the back of the packet, it has all been changed.

We see very unusual weather patterns developing all across our Nation and the world.

We can't put our heads in the sand and deny reality. There is a reality out there.

There was a book written called, "Last Child in the Woods," and it talks about how most Americans now don't spend enough time outdoors. In fact, a lot of them are even afraid to be out there. So a lot of people spend their life in air-conditioned situations or well-heated situations and don't really look at what is happening to our ecosystem.

In May, our Nation's leading climate scientists released the National Climate Assessment, which confirmed that climate change is real, it is caused by humans, and it is already harming communities across America. The assessment explains that scientific evidence is "unequivocal." This amendment tells the Department to ignore these scientific findings.

The latest science shows that climate change is expected to exacerbate heat waves. Has anybody noticed the erratic nature of what is happening in the places you live?

Droughts. I heard Senator FEINSTEIN say the other day that California is become a desert State. Interesting statement.

Wildfires. Who can deny those?

Floods and water- and vector-borne diseases will pose greater risk to human health, to animal life, and any living creatures around us.

It is interesting to me that, in my own State, the pork industry is undergoing an incredible implosion because of something that is infecting the hog population and they are being lost, not by the tens or the hundreds or the thousands, but by the millions. There is something wrong.

Wheat and corn yields are already experiencing negative impact due to climate change. After 2050, the risk of overall declining crop yields increases substantially.

Federal agencies have a responsibility to calculate the cost of climate change and take them into account.

Unfortunately, what this amendment would require is that the government assume zero harm and zero cost from carbon pollution and carbon change.

The truth is that unchecked climate change would have catastrophic economic impacts here in the United States and across the globe. Those who are less fortunate will bear the heaviest burdens.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. Don't be a science denier. Pretending that climate change doesn't exist won't make it go away. Maybe every single Member of this Chamber should have to enroll in some STEM classes so that science and technology and engineering and math are a part of our DNA and it might be easier to really evaluate the world around us with more objectivity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad for the Members of this body to enroll in a science class. I would also be glad for the Members of this body to enroll in a world history class and possibly look at the history of the Earth.

Do you realize there were glaciers in Ohio centuries ago?

If we are talking about weather today, we are talking about a different topic. We are talking about an administration not following the Administrative Procedure Act.

If this is about an administration saying they can change rules as they choose to, I look forward to seeing that same standard being applied to Republican Presidents in the days ahead.

But when an administration can change a rule without notice and comment and shift the social cost of carbon by 50 percent in a 3-year time period without following the rule, without following the law, so much so that when we addressed it in a hearing, they admitted it, set the rule aside, and then the EPA chose to use it anyway, we are not talking about weather anymore. We are suddenly talking about the rule of law.

□ 1400

Now, this is not an area on which we had disagreement—Republicans and Democrats—in committee because it was clear that the administration did not follow the rule of law. This is a simple statement. It is not a statement

about climate change. It is not a statement about a future ice age or of a future flood. It is a statement about: Do we choose to follow the law or not?

If someone wants to argue that we shouldn't follow the Administrative Procedure Act, I look forward to the day when we just set the entire thing aside and let the administration do whatever it wants to at any point, but I hope that day does not occur and that we do follow the rule of law and require the administration to do the same.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I would inquire of the time remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The gentlewoman from Ohio has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oklahoma has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me say that Federal agencies have a responsibility to calculate the costs of climate change and to take them into account. This amendment would tell the Department to ignore those impacts, and that, in my judgment, is irresponsible.

The administration is using common sense, and that was the clear message from the Government Accountability Office when it added climate change to its high-risk list. That is exactly what the Obama administration is doing.

An interagency task force worked over the last couple of years to estimate the costs of harm from carbon pollution. The cost calculation was first issued in 2010, and a refined and updated calculation was published last year.

It incorporated updated scientific and technical information, and it was a very conservative calculation. The full costs of climate change are almost certainly going to be significantly higher, but it is better than the previous estimate, and it is much, much better than assuming that the costs are zero.

So I urge my colleagues to reject the Lankford amendment. Again, don't be a science denier. Let's not pretend climate change doesn't exist. That won't make it go away.

Let's behave as though we care about future generations and are doing our very best to meet the challenges of the current era.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANKFORD. I can assure you I have great care, Mr. Chairman, for future generations, as I do for this generation and as I do for the United States Constitution.

No administration can ignore the Administrative Procedure Act, change it capriciously by 50 percent and say, I have new science, and go into a room and literally not publish who was in the room, not take any public comment, not even disclose what the memos were or all of the models that were even used in the discussion, but just say, I am going to change this by 50 percent because there have been up-

dates, and so everyone's costs just went up dramatically.

That is not the way we work things in America. This is not about science. This is about law, though this is the first time I have ever heard anyone, Mr. Chairman, discuss the loss of piglets as being connected to weather, as has been discussed on the floor today. It was a virus that spread across the entire United States. This is not about piglets. This is not about weather. This is just law.

With that, I would encourage the passage of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma will be postponed.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. I wonder if the chairman would be willing to engage in a brief colloquy regarding transparency and accountability regarding transmission and capacity market changes imposed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Mr. SIMPSON. I would be happy to join the gentlelady in a colloquy.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for working with me on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, in January, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, known as FERC, approved a proposal by the New York Independent System Operator to create a new capacity zone in the Hudson Valley. The committee report accompanying the fiscal year 2015 Energy and Water Appropriations bill acknowledges that zones like this one may result in increases in consumer energy costs.

In the case of the Hudson Valley, this new zone would impose an unprecedented \$230 million increase in energy costs for our region in just the first year and nearly \$500 million in increased costs over a 3-year period. Initial estimates suggest that customers throughout the Hudson Valley could see their utility bills go up by 3 to 10 percent.

Not only did FERC approve this new zone, but they have completely disregarded ratepayers and local officials in this decision. They have consistently ignored local stakeholders' warn-

ings that this zone will arbitrarily hurt families and businesses.

Moreover, they have failed to demonstrate that the zone would even achieve the result that they are seeking. FERC has also failed to take into account a wide range of ongoing investments that will facilitate the movement of energy in New York State and which may reduce or eliminate the need for such high-capacity payments.

Would the chairman and the ranking member agree that it is the intent of the report language to ensure that FERC reexamines and reforms the way they conduct this type of decision-making, so that the proceedings ensure the Commissioners hear and consider the concerns of local ratepayers?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, I would agree that that is the intent.

Ms. KAPTUR. I also agree.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member.

Would you also be committed to continuing to work with me during fiscal year 2015 to ensure that FERC makes reforms to ensure that the views of residents, local and State officials, regulators, and business leaders are taken into account when FERC makes these major decisions?

Mr. SIMPSON. I would agree to do so, and I believe the gentlelady from Ohio would agree to do so as well.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, I have amendment No. 91 at the desk, a limitation amendment regarding life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions and LNG exportation.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy to apply the report entitled "Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas from the United States", published in the Federal Register on June 4, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 32260), in any public interest determination under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, the United States is the largest producer of natural gas in the world and has a large and growing natural gas reserves base.

The Energy Information Administration estimates that proven and unproven reserves of natural gas are large enough to fuel America for over 90 years at current consumption rates, and more is being found.

A study sponsored by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and published by IHS concluded that unconventional gas development supported over 900,000 jobs in recent years.

The U.S. Department of Energy, however, recently changed the process by which it reviews and approves liquefied natural gas export projects to non-free trade agreement countries.

Among its process changes, the DOE is releasing a new environmental report that explores the life-cycle greenhouse gas impact of U.S. LNG exports. According to the DOE, the report will be used to “inform its decisions” regarding greenhouse gas emissions of U.S. LNG exports for use in electric power generation in Europe and Asia.

With this new report, the DOE is compromising with intervening environmental groups that want the criteria and scope of the “public interest” to include life-cycle greenhouse gas emission impacts.

While the DOE claims that impacts are not “reasonably foreseeable” at this time, by acknowledging special interest environmental group requests for expanded scope of review beyond the LNG facility, the DOE opens the door to prolonged litigation.

LNG export projects already go through extensive environmental impact analysis during the project’s National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, review. This new report adds another layer of legal risk and uncertainty to an already extensive and difficult process.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports the Cassidy-Fleming amendment and notes that the DOE’s sole jurisdiction lies in considering the public interest of exporting the commodity and should not waste funds, potentially delaying license application review in an effort beyond its jurisdiction.

The Cassidy-Fleming amendment prohibits the DOE from applying its report or the perceived impact on life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions in its LNG export public interest determination process, so I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Louisiana, Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank my good friend, who is also from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), and I do support the Cassidy-Fleming amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the President has bragged about the increase in energy production during his tenure as President of the United States.

However, what we have actually found is that there has been a 15 percent decline in energy production on Federal lands and offshore, where he is in control. On the other hand, in the private sector, we have had a veritable explosion in production, if you don’t mind my using that term.

What is that reflective of? It is reflective of the miracle that is fracking, which is going on in the U.S. today.

One of the centers of that is the Haynesville shale in my district, where

we have produced an abundance of natural gas. We used to have to import it from other countries. Today, we have such a glut that we have capped many of the wells.

Natural gas is the cleanest carbon-based energy; so, while we are taking down coal, why aren’t we increasing the production of natural gas? In doing so, why not supply it to the rest of the world? Because the air we breathe in the United States is the same air they breathe in China and in Russia and vice versa.

I support this amendment. Let’s stop throwing monkey wrenches into the machinery of natural gas production and energy production in general, and let’s get the cost of energy down for Americans.

Let’s stop this nonsense, this hyperregulatory atmosphere we have. Despite the President’s claim, it is American ingenuity—it is innovation by Americans, specifically fracking technology and horizontal drilling—that has brought about this wonderful miracle that we have.

Let’s get on board. Let’s get both sides of the aisle on board with this, and let’s stop messing around with our technology. This is going to be the first LNG export facility—that is, Lake Charles, which is just below my district, in Congressman BOUSTANY’s district—from which we are going to be supplying the rest of the world with natural gas—which, as I say, has half the carbon footprint of coal.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, when a company wants to export liquefied natural gas, LNG, it has to submit an application with the Department of Energy.

For the export to countries with a free trade agreement with the U.S., the DOE must grant the applications without modification or delay. For the export to countries without a free trade agreement, the DOE has to approve an application, unless it finds that the proposed export will not be consistent with the public interest.

To make this determination, the DOE evaluates a range of factors. It looks at the economic impacts, the international considerations, U.S. energy security, and environmental effects.

Mr. CASSIDY’s amendment would prohibit the DOE from even considering one of the most important factors: the impact of LNG exports on climate change. I don’t understand why we would do that.

The world’s leading scientists are unequivocal: climate change is already happening on all continents and across the oceans, and it is going to get much worse if we don’t cut our emissions of carbon and other greenhouse gases.

□ 1415

So that would mean that we need to scrutinize the energy infrastructure decisions that we make today for their impact on climate change in the future. Every decision to build a new LNG export terminal has climate implications. We need to understand and weigh those effects.

Now, whether exporting LNG will have a positive or a negative impact on global greenhouse gas emissions is a complex but a critical question. Natural gas consumption for electricity emits less carbon pollution than coal. So proponents of LNG exports argue these exports will displace coal consumption in these other countries, the way it is happening here in the United States, and that would produce a climate benefit; but other LNG exports will raise natural gas prices in the United States, which could increase the coal use here in the United States and carbon pollution from coal-fired power plants. So, on the one hand, it helps; on the other hand, it might hurt.

LNG exports would also drive new domestic natural gas production in the U.S. Now, that could increase emissions of methane—that is a potent greenhouse gas—unless we take measures to control that pollution at the wellhead and throughout the natural gas system.

So, if we are going to live in a carbon-constrained world, we need to understand and consider the climate impacts of key energy policy decisions, such as building a new LNG export terminal and exporting America’s natural gas.

Mr. CASSIDY’s amendment takes a head-in-the-sand approach. DOE shouldn’t even look at this. DOE shouldn’t look at the lifecycle carbon emissions from LNG. This amendment says that DOE can’t even consider those findings for any future studies of climate impacts when making a public interest determination.

If you are going to have the consequences of climate change, shouldn’t we know about it if we are going to say that a particular application is or is not in the public interest?

Considering climate impacts is not going to slow down the review process. Nobody has made that argument. It makes no sense to require DOE to make a determination without the benefit of all the facts.

Ignoring climate change will not make it go away. Quite the opposite. So I am urging my colleagues to oppose this amendment. It is a shortsighted amendment.

DOE has to make a determination in those cases where it is before them on what is the public interest. They have to look at the economic impacts. They have to look at international considerations. They have to look at U.S. energy security and environmental effects.

Why should we say they should look at everything else but not be able to look at the environmental effect if it

deals with climate change? It is a mystery to me why we would want to do something like this.

Now, Mr. CASSIDY made an argument that that is not within the jurisdiction of DOE. Well, we know DOE can look at energy security, but the economic impacts, they are going to have to look to other agencies of the government to help them with that one. The international considerations, they will probably want the State Department and others to help them with that one.

So don't limit DOE and take away their jurisdiction as they make what is in the public interest, because it is in the public interest to look at all these considerations.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, California, like most of the West and Midwest, is suffering and enduring a devastating drought. This is impacting the livelihoods of our families, our farmers, our small businesses throughout the State. California produces about half of the Nation's fruits, vegetables, and nuts; in other words, California feeds the rest of the country.

California's Governor wants to move forward with something called the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, or the BDCP, which will build two massive tunnels to facilitate shipping water from one part of the State to the other.

I agree with every Californian that we need long-term, statewide solutions to our State's water needs. There needs to be some level of predictability for our families, farmers, and small businesses about our water supply. To do that, we need to focus on conservation, recycling, reuse, and storage. The BDCP does none of these things.

California voters and the State legislature haven't agreed on whether or not to fund this project, which is ex-

pected to cost \$25 billion, a cost that keeps rising. The project is still in the draft stage. Right now, the plan is already more than 30,000 pages, and final comments aren't even due until the end of July. According to the plan, the Federal Government is expected to contribute \$4 billion.

Anyone who follows California water knows it is an emotional issue, one the State has been debating for decades. But the BDCP is not based on sound science. For example, the Delta Independent Science Board issued a report this year that said:

We find the science in this BDCP falls short of what the project requires. Many of the impact assessments hinge on overly optimistic expectations about the feasibility, effectiveness, or timing of the proposed conservation actions, especially habitat restoration.

The Science Board goes on to say:

The analyses largely neglect the influences of levee failures and environmental effects of increased water for agriculture.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for making time for me to discuss this important issue today, and I hope in the future we can look at this type of funding from the Federal Government.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chair, over the past four years, I have been heavily engaged in the BDCP process, actively promoting Sacramento's interest to President Obama's administration, Governor Brown's administration and the many stakeholders that would be affected by the project.

It has not been an easy road as we all know.

While I support a Delta solution because a sustainable system is necessary, I continue to have serious concerns that the BDCP process will ultimately create significant and irreversible harm to the Sacramento region.

GOVERNANCE

First, the BDCP process must respect northern California's interests. Unfortunately, it currently does not. The current governance structure of the BDCP includes the Delta water exporters and the state and federal water agencies. There is no representation for us in that structure. We cannot affect the process at all. We are left to a spectator role.

Given that this project is the largest water infrastructure project ever undertaken by California and that it has a permit for 50 years attached to it—this governance structure is totally unacceptable.

Here is why governance matters. Northern California was clearly harmed this year by the poor operations of our reservoirs. Yes, the drought has caused the low water levels in our reservoirs, but we should NEVER have a community on the brink of running out of drinking water. That is totally unacceptable. And with a BDCP in place and no role in the governance structure we would not be able to prevent operations, like this year, from happening again.

OPERATIONS

Sacramento County is the home of the BDCP's three water intakes; this will forever change our County's landscape not to mention how much water is available in the river.

The current BDCP framework does not specify how the project will be operated, quite literally building the project first and then fig-

uring out how much water to send south later. This is also unacceptable.

You can imagine that after the Delta water exporters spend over \$15 billion building a new conveyance structure there will be tremendous pressure to maximize its water delivery output.

There have been times where the entire flow of the Sacramento River has been less than 15,000 cfs. Under the BDCP framework announced today, this would mean the Sacramento River would be reduced . . . to a trickle.

In addition, this plan must recognize senior water rights in northern California. Currently there are no assurances that those will be preserved.

THE DELTA

I also need to mention that the BDCP was created to solve two pressing issues—restoration of the Delta and a stable water supply for Delta water exporters. All I have seen is an urgency to push a new water conveyance with a guaranteed water supply for the exporters. I have not seen glowing reports from the fish agencies that the BDCP is going to guarantee restoration of the Delta ecosystem. To the contrary the state and federal Fish and Wildlife and National Marine Fisheries sound doubtful that the BDCP will recover the salmon and smelt species.

In conclusion, I will just say that what I have seen of the BDCP is alarming. I do not believe that its current form will achieve California's co-equal goals. And as for Northern California—there are no benefits—only negative impacts.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment. The proposed Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) is not a workable solution to California's water challenges.

We have a serious statewide drought in California, yet the BDCP doesn't do a single thing to alleviate this drought. Further, the current BDCP is flawed, hurts wildlife and puts the interests of South-of-Delta water contractors ahead of North-of-Delta farmers, fishers and small business owners.

Until we have a plan that is transparent, based on sound science and developed with all stakeholders at the table, the federal government shouldn't be wasting taxpayer dollars on this proposal.

We must remain focused on solutions to the statewide drought in California and not on a misguided plan that will risk billions in California tax dollars and thousands of jobs. I support this amendment and thank my colleague for raising this important issue.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

An amendment by Ms. BONAMICI of Oregon.

An amendment by Ms. SPEIER of California.

Amendment No. 15 by Ms. TITUS of Nevada.

An amendment by Mr. SCHIFF of California.

An amendment by Mr. QUIGLEY of Illinois.

An amendment by Mr. CHABOT of Ohio.

Amendment No. 14 by Ms. TITUS of Nevada.

An amendment by Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut.

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa.

An amendment by Mr. LANKFORD of Oklahoma.

An amendment by Mr. CASSIDY of Louisiana.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 129, noes 290, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

AYES—129

Amash	Harris	Pittenger
Amodei	Hensarling	Pitts
Bachmann	Holding	Poe (TX)
Benishek	Hudson	Posey
Bentivolio	Huelskamp	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Huizenga (MI)	Ribble
Black	Hultgren	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hurt	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Issa	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins	Rokita
Brown (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Bucshon	Jones	Roskam
Burgess	Jordan	Ross
Byrne	King (IA)	Royce
Campbell	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Cassidy	Labrador	Salmon
Chabot	LaMalfa	Sanford
Chaffetz	Lance	Scalise
Clawson (FL)	Lankford	Schweikert
Coble	Long	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lummis	Sessions
Cook	Marchant	Smith (MO)
Cotton	Massie	Smith (NE)
Cramer	McCarthy (CA)	Southerland
Culberson	McClintock	Stewart
Daines	McHenry	Stockman
DeSantis	McMorris	Stutzman
Duffy	Rodgers	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	Meadows	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	Messer	Walorski
Fincher	Mica	Weber (TX)
Fleming	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Fox	Miller, Gary	Wenstrup
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Westmoreland
Garrett	Mulvaney	Williams
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Gingrey (GA)	Noem	Woodall
Gohmert	Nunes	Yoder
Gosar	Olson	Yoho
Godwy	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Graves (GA)	Perry	
Hall	Petri	

Bachus	Gerlach	NOES—290	Napolitano
Barber	Gibson		Neal
Barletta	Goodlatte		Negrete McLeod
Barr	Granger		Nolan
Barrow (GA)	Graves (MO)		Nugent
Barton	Grayson		O'Rourke
Bass	Green, Al		Owens
Beatty	Green, Gene		Pallone
Becerra	Griffin (AR)		Pascrell
Bera (CA)	Griffith (VA)		Pastor (AZ)
Bilirakis	Grijalva		Payne
Bishop (GA)	Guthrie		Pearce
Bishop (NY)	Gutiérrez		Pelosi
Blumenauer	Hahn		Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hanna		Peters (CA)
Boustany	Harper		Peters (MI)
Brady (PA)	Hartzer		Peterson
Braley (IA)	Hastings (FL)		Pingree (ME)
Brooks (IN)	Hastings (WA)		Pocan
Brown (FL)	Heck (NV)		Polis
Brownley (CA)	Heck (WA)		Price (NC)
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler		Quigley
Bustos	Higgins		Rahall
Butterfield	Himes		Reed
Calvert	Hinojosa		Reichert
Camp	Holt		Renauci
Cantor	Honda		Rigell
Capito	Horsford		Roby
Capps	Hoyer		Rogers (KY)
Capuano	Huffman		Rogers (MI)
Cárdenas	Israel		Ros-Lehtinen
Carson (IN)	Jeffries		Rothfus
Carter	Johnson (OH)		Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.		Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Jolly		Runyan
Castro (TX)	Joyce		Ruppersberger
Chu	Kaptur		Rush
Cicilline	Keating		Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)		Sánchez, Linda T.
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (PA)		Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kennedy		Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kildee		Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kilmer		Schiff
Coffman	Kind		Schneider
Cohen	King (NY)		Schock
Cole	Kinzinger (IL)		Schrader
Collins (NY)	Kirkpatrick		Schwartz
Connolly	Kline		Scott (VA)
Conyers	Kuster		Scott, David
Cooper	Lamborn		Serrano
Costa	Langevin		Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Larsen (WA)		Shea-Porter
Crawford	Larson (CT)		Sherman
Crenshaw	Latham		Shimkus
Crowley	Latta		Shuster
Cuellar	Lee (CA)		Simpson
Cummings	Levin		Sinema
Davis (CA)	Lewis		Sires
Davis, Danny	Lipinski		Slaughter
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo		Smith (NJ)
DeFazio	Loeb sack		Smith (TX)
DeGette	Lofgren		Smith (WA)
Delaney	Lowenthal		Speier
DeLauro	Lowe		Stivers
DelBene	Lucas		Swalwell (CA)
Denham	Lujan Grisham		Takano
Dent	(NM)		Terry
Deutch	Luján, Ben Ray		Lynch
Diaz-Balart	(NM)		Maffei
Dingell			Maloney,
Doggett			Carolyn
Doyle			Maloney, Sean
Duckworth			Marino
Edwards			Matheson
Ellison			Matsui
Ellmers			McAllister
Engel			McCaul
Enyart			McCollum
Eshoo			McDermott
Esty			McGovern
Farenthold			McIntyre
Farr			McKeon
Fattah			McKinley
Fitzpatrick			McNerney
Fleischmann			Meehan
Flores			Meeks
Forbes			Meng
Fortenberry			Michaud
Foster			Miller (MI)
Frankel (FL)			Miller, George
Frelinghuysen			Moore
Fudge			Moran
Gabbard			Murphy (FL)
Gallo			Murphy (PA)
Galleo			Nadler
Garamendi			
Garcia			
Gardner			

Wilson (FL)
Wittman

Wolf
Womack

Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1458

Mr. GERLACH, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Messrs. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, WELCH, RUSH, LYNCH, ELLISON, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. BARR changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. BUCSHON, RICE of South Carolina, and SOUTHERLAND changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 199, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

AYES—221

Barber	Davis (CA)	Heck (WA)
Barrow (GA)	Davis, Danny	Herrera Beutler
Bass	DeFazio	Higgins
Beatty	DeGette	Himes
Becerra	Delaney	Hinojosa
Benishek	DeLauro	Holt
Bera (CA)	DelBene	Honda
Bishop (GA)	Deutch	Horsford
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Hoyer
Blumenauer	Doggett	Huffman
Bonamici	Duckworth	Israel
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Jeffries
Braley (IA)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (FL)	Engel	Jones
Brownley (CA)	Enyart	Kaptur
Bustos	Eshoo	Keating
Butterfield	Esty	Kelly (IL)
Capps	Farr	Kennedy
Cárdenas	Fitzpatrick	Kildee
Carson (IN)	Foster	Kilmer
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Kind
Castor (FL)	Fudge	King (NY)
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Kirkpatrick
Chu	Gallo	Kuster
Cicilline	Garamendi	Langevin
Clark (MA)	Garcia	Larsen (WA)
Clarke (NY)	Gardner	Larson (CT)
Clay	Gibson	Lee (CA)
Cleaver	Goodlatte	Levin
Clyburn	Gosar	Lewis
Coble	Graves (MO)	Lipinski
Coffman	Grayson	LoBiondo
Cohen	Green, Al	Loeb sack
Connolly	Green, Gene	Lofgren
Conyers	Grijalva	Lowenthal
Cooper	Gutiérrez	Lowe
Costa	Hahn	Lujan Grisham
Courtney	Hanna	(NM)
Crowley	Harris	Luján, Ben Ray
Cuellar	Hastings (FL)	(NM)
Cummings	Heck (NV)	Lynch

Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne

Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reichert
Renacci
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)

Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—199

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry

Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gowdy
Granger
Paulsen
Pearce
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Westrup
Westmoreland
Whitefield
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
Grimm

Hanabusa
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
McCarthy (NY)

Nunnelee
Pompeo
Rangel
Richmond

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1502

Messrs. MARCHANT and MESSER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”
Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 235, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

AYES—184

Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry

Delaney
DeSantis
Deutch
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Focht
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Gohmert
Gowdy
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Holding
Holt
Honda
Hudson
Coble
Huelskamp
Huffman
Connolly
Israel
Jeffries
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Keating
Kelly (IL)

Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Labrador
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Maffei
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod

Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Quigley
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roe (TN)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stockman
Stutzman

Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

NOES—235

Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frelinghuysen
Gallo
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach

Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Horsford
Hoyer
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Messer
Michaud

Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski

Weber (TX)	Williams	Womack
Webster (FL)	Wilson (SC)	Yarmuth
Westmoreland	Wittman	Young (AK)
Whitfield	Wolf	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Cantor	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Carney	McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (KY)
DesJarlais	Nunnelee	
Hanabusa	Pompeo	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1506

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 75, noes 344,
not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—75

Amodei	Hahn	Payne
Beatty	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Becerra	Heck (NV)	Peters (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Holt	Pocan
Blumenauer	Honda	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Roybal-Allard
Capps	Huffman	Ruiz
Capuano	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda
Chaffetz	Lee (CA)	T.
Chu	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Lewis	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Lofgren	Scott, David
Cleaver	Lowenthal	Serrano
Conyers	Lujan, Ben Ray	Shea-Porter
Crowley	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Stewart
Deutch	Matsui	Takano
Doggett	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Edwards	McKeon	Tierney
Ellison	Meeks	Titus
Engel	Meng	Tsongas
Eshoo	Nadler	Velázquez
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Wasserman
Grijalva	Negrete McLeod	Schultz
Gutiérrez	Pallone	Waxman

NOES—344

Amash	Boustany	Cantor
Bachmann	Brady (PA)	Capito
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Cardenas
Barber	Braley (IA)	Carson (IN)
Barletta	Bridenstine	Carter
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Cartwright
Barrow (GA)	Brooks (IN)	Cassidy
Barton	Brown (GA)	Castro (TX)
Bass	Brown (FL)	Chabot
Benishek	Buchanan	Cicilline
Bentivolio	Bucshon	Clawson (FL)
Bera (CA)	Burgess	Clay
Billrakis	Bustos	Clyburn
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Coble
Bishop (NY)	Byrne	Coffman
Black	Calvert	Cohen
Blackburn	Camp	Cole
Bonamici	Campbell	Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Price (NC)
Conaway	Jolly	Quigley
Connolly	Jones	Rahall
Cook	Jordan	Reed
Cooper	Joyce	Reichert
Costa	Kaptur	Renacci
Cotton	Keating	Ribble
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Rice (SC)
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Rigell
Crawford	Kildee	Roby
Crenshaw	Kilmer	Roe (TN)
Cuellar	Kind	Rogers (AL)
Cummings	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Daines	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Danny	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita
DeFazio	Kline	Rooney
DeGette	Kuster	Ros-Lehtinen
Delaney	Labrador	Roskam
DeLauro	LaMalfa	Ross
DelBene	Lamborn	Rothfus
Denham	Lance	Royce
Dent	Langevin	Ryunan
DeSantis	Lankford	Ruppersberger
Diaz-Balart	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Ryan (WI)
Doyle	Latham	Salmon
Duckworth	Latta	Sanford
Duffy	Lipinski	Sarbanes
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Scalise
Duncan (TN)	Loeb sack	Schiff
Ellmers	Long	Schneider
Enyart	Lowey	Schock
Esty	Lucas	Schrader
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Schwartz
Farr	Lujan Grisham	Schweikert
Fattah	(NM)	Scott (VA)
Fincher	Lummis	Scott, Austin
Fitzpatrick	Lynch	Sensenbrenner
Fleischmann	Maffei	Sessions
Fleming	Maloney,	Sewell (AL)
Flores	Carolyn	Sherman
Forbes	Maloney, Sean	Shimkus
Fortenberry	Marchant	Shuster
Foster	Marino	Simpson
Fox	Massie	Sinema
Franks (AZ)	McAllister	Sires
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)	Slaughter
Fudge	McCaul	Smith (MO)
Gabbard	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Gallego	McCollum	Smith (NJ)
Garcia	McDermott	Smith (TX)
Gardner	McHenry	Southerland
Garrett	McIntyre	Speier
Gerlach	McKinley	Stivers
Gibbs	McMorris	Stockman
Gibson	Rodgers	Stutzman
Gingrey (GA)	McNerney	Swalwell (CA)
Gohmert	Meadows	Terry
Goodlatte	Meehan	Thompson (MS)
Gosar	Messer	Thompson (PA)
Gowdy	Mica	Thornberry
Granger	Michaud	Tiberi
Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)	Tipton
Graves (MO)	Miller (MI)	Tonko
Grayson	Miller, Gary	Turner
Green, Al	Miller, George	Upton
Green, Gene	Moore	Valadao
Griffin (AR)	Moran	Van Hollen
Griffith (VA)	Mullin	Vargas
Grimm	Mulvaney	Veasey
Guthrie	Murphy (FL)	Vela
Hall	Murphy (PA)	Visclosky
Hanna	Neal	Wagner
Harper	Neugebauer	Walberg
Harris	Noem	Walden
Hartzler	Nolan	Walorski
Hastings (WA)	Nugent	Walz
Heck (WA)	Nunes	Waters
Hensarling	O'Rourke	Weber (TX)
Herrera Beutler	Olson	Webster (FL)
Higgins	Owens	Welch
Himes	Palazzo	Wenstrup
Hinojosa	Pascarella	Clyburn
Holding	Pastor (AZ)	Coble
Hoyer	Paulsen	Cohen
Hudson	Pearce	Connolly
Huelskamp	Perlmutter	Conyers
Huizenga (MI)	Perry	Cooper
Hultgren	Peters (CA)	Costa
Hunter	Peterson	Courtney
Hurt	Petri	Crowley
Israel	Pingree (ME)	Cuellar
Issa	Pittenger	Cummings
Jeffries	Pitts	Davis (CA)
Jenkins	Poe (TX)	Davis, Danny
Johnson (OH)	Posney	DeFazio
Johnson, E. B.	Price (GA)	DeGette

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt	Hanabusa	Pompeo
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Culberson	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
DesJarlais	McCarthy (NY)	
Garamendi	Nunnelee	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1511

Mr. CICILLINE changed his vote
from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 216, noes 205,
not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

AYES—216

Barber	DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.
Barrow (GA)	DelBene	Jolly
Barton	Dent	Jones
Bass	Deutch	Kaptur
Beatty	Dingell	Keating
Becerra	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Benishek	Doyle	Kennedy
Bera (CA)	Duckworth	Kildee
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Kilmer
Bishop (NY)	Ellison	Kind
Blumenauer	Engel	King (NY)
Bonamici	Enyart	Kirkpatrick
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Kuster
Braley (IA)	Esty	Langevin
Brooks (AL)	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Brownley (CA)	Fitzpatrick	Lee (CA)
Burgess	Flores	Levin
Bustos	Foster	Lewis
Butterfield	Frankel (FL)	Lipinski
Capps	Fudge	LoBiondo
Capuano	Gabbard	Loeb sack
Cárdenas	Gallego	Lofgren
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Lowenthal
Cartwright	Garcia	Lowey
Castor (FL)	Gerlach	Lujan Grisham
Castro (TX)	Gibson	(NM)
Chu	Goodlatte	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cicilline	Grayson	(NM)
Clark (MA)	Green, Al	Lynch
Clarke (NY)	Green, Gene	Maffei
Clay	Griffith (VA)	Maloney,
Cleaver	Grijalva	Carolyn
Clyburn	Grimm	Maloney, Sean
Coble	Hahn	Matheson
Cohen	Harris	Matsui
Connolly	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Conyers	Heck (NV)	McDermott
Cooper	Heck (WA)	McGovern
Costa	Higgins	McIntyre
Courtney	Himes	McNerney
Crowley	Hinojosa	Meeks
Cuellar	Holt	Meng
Cummings	Honda	Mica
Davis (CA)	Horsford	Michaud
Davis, Danny	Huffman	Miller, George
DeFazio	Israel	Moore
DeGette	Jeffries	Moran
Delaney	Johnson (GA)	Murphy (FL)

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reichert
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger

Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)

Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOES—205

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie

Gutiérrez
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson

Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt
Bilirakis
Carney
DesJarlais

Hanabusa
Jackson Lee
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee

Pompeo
Rangel
Richmond

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1515

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIGLEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 181, noes 239,
not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—181

Amash
Bachmann
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brownlee (CA)
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carlson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciциlline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei

Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Loftgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lynch
Maffei

Maloney,
Carolyn
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schwartz

Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Speier
Stockman
Takano
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky

NOES—239

Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallo
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen

Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Scalise
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
Hanabusa

Jackson Lee
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee
Pompeo

Rangel
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Vela

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1518

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) on
which further proceedings were post-
poned and on which the noes prevailed
by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 176, noes 243,
not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

AYES—176

Amash	Gosar	Neugebauer
Amodei	Gowdy	Noem
Bachmann	Graves (GA)	Nugent
Barrow (GA)	Graves (MO)	Olson
Barton	Griffin (AR)	Palazzo
Bentivolio	Hall	Paulsen
Bilirakis	Hanna	Perlmutter
Black	Harper	Perry
Blackburn	Harris	Peters (CA)
Boustany	Hartzler	Petri
Brady (TX)	Heck (NV)	Pittenger
Braley (IA)	Hensarling	Pitts
Bridenstine	Holding	Poe (TX)
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Polis
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Posey
Broun (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Price (GA)
Buchanan	Hultgren	Renacci
Burgess	Hunter	Ribble
Byrne	Hurt	Rice (SC)
Camp	Issa	Rigell
Cantor	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Cassidy	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Jolly	Rohrabacher
Chaffetz	Jones	Rokita
Clawson (FL)	Jordan	Rooney
Coble	Kind	Roskam
Coffman	King (IA)	Ross
Cohen	Kingston	Rothfus
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Royce
Collins (NY)	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	Labrador	Salmon
Cooper	LaMalfa	Sanford
Cotton	Lamborn	Scalise
Cramer	Lance	Schock
Crenshaw	Lankford	Schweikert
Daines	Latta	Scott, Austin
Davis, Rodney	Levin	Sensenbrenner
DeSantis	Long	Sessions
Doggett	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Duffy	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Duncan (SC)	Maffei	Smith (TX)
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Stewart
Ellmers	Massie	Stockman
Farenthold	Matheson	Stutzman
Fleischmann	McCauley	Thornberry
Fleming	McClintock	Tiberi
Flores	McDermott	Tipton
Forbes	McHenry	Tonko
Fox	McKinley	Upton
Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Wagner
Fudge	Messer	Walberg
Gardner	Mica	Walorski
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Mulvaney	Wenstrup
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Goodlatte	Negrete McLeod	

Wilson (SC)
WittmanYarmuth
YoderYoho
Young (IN)

□ 1522

NOES—243

Bachus	Grayson	Pallone
Barber	Green, Al	Pascarelli
Barletta	Green, Gene	Pastor (AZ)
Barr	Griffith (VA)	Payne
Beatty	Grijalva	Pearce
Becerra	Grimm	Pelosi
Benish	Guthrie	Peters (MI)
Bera (CA)	Gutierrez	Peterson
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Pingree (ME)
Bishop (NY)	Hastings (FL)	Pocan
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Quigley
Bonamici	Herrera Beutler	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Higgins	Reed
Brown (FL)	Himes	Reichert
Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Roby
Bucshon	Holt	Rogers (KY)
Bustos	Horsford	Rogers (MI)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Campbell	Israel	Ruiz
Capito	Jeffries	Runyan
Capps	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Capuano	Johnson (OH)	Rush
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Joyce	Sánchez, Linda
Carter	Kaptur	T.
Cartwright	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Castro (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Schakowsky
Chu	Kennedy	Schiff
Cicilline	Kildee	Schneider
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	King (NY)	Schwartz
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Kuster	Scott, David
Clyburn	Langevin	Serrano
Cole	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Shea-Porter
Conyers	Latham	Sherman
Cook	Lee (CA)	Shimkus
Costa	Lewis	Shuster
Courtney	Lipinski	Simpson
Crawford	LoBlundo	Sinema
Crowley	Loeb	Sires
Cuellar	Loeb	Slaughter
Culberson	Lofgren	Smith (NJ)
Cummings	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lowe	Southerland
Davis, Danny	Lucas	Speier
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Stivers
DeGette	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
DeLauro	(NM)	Terry
DelBene	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Denham	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Dent	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (PA)
Deutch	Marino	Tierney
Diaz-Balart	Matsui	Titus
Dingell	McAllister	Tsongas
Doyle	McCarthy (CA)	Turner
Duckworth	McCollum	Valadao
Edwards	McGovern	Van Hollen
Ellison	McIntyre	Vargas
Engel	McKeon	Veasey
Enyart	McNerney	Vela
Eshoo	Meehan	Velázquez
Esty	Meeks	Visclosky
Farr	Meng	Walden
Fattah	Michaud	Walz
Fincher	Miller (MI)	Wasserman
Fitzpatrick	Miller, George	Schultz
Fortenberry	Moore	Waters
Foster	Moran	Waxman
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Frelinghuysen	Nadler	Westmoreland
Gabbard	Napolitano	Whitfield
Gallego	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Garamendi	Nolan	Wolf
García	Nunes	Womack
Gerlach	O'Rourke	Woodall
Gibson	Owens	Young (AK)
Granger		

NOT VOTING—13

Honda	Nunnelee
Jackson Lee	Pompeo
McCarthy (NY)	Rangel
McMorris	Richmond
Rodgers	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

Mrs. ELLMERS changed her vote
from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. TITUS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS)
on which further proceedings were post-
poned and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 96, noes 326,
not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

AYES—96

Amodei	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bass	Heck (NV)	Perlmutter
Beatty	Holt	Peters (MI)
Becerra	Honda	Pocan
Bishop (UT)	Horsford	Polis
Blumenauer	Huffman	Roybal-Allard
Brownley (CA)	Jones	Ruiz
Capps	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)
Capuano	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda
Cartwright	Langevin	T.
Castor (FL)	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Chaffetz	Levin	Sarbanes
Chu	Lewis	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Lofgren	Schrader
Clark (MA)	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Conyers	(NM)	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman
Davis (CA)	(NM)	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lynch	Speier
DeFazio	Maloney,	Stewart
DeGette	Carolyn	Takano
DeLauro	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Matsui	Tierney
Doggett	McGovern	Titus
Edwards	McKeon	Tsongas
Ellison	McNerney	Vargas
Engel	Meeks	Velázquez
Eshoo	Meng	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Schultz
Fudge	Napolitano	Waters
Garamendi	Negrete McLeod	Waxman
Grijalva	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Hahn	Payne	

NOES—326

Amash	Broun (GA)	Coffman
Bachmann	Brown (FL)	Cohen
Bachus	Buchanan	Cole
Barber	Bucshon	Collins (GA)
Barletta	Burgess	Collins (NY)
Barr	Bustos	Conaway
Barrow (GA)	Butterfield	Connolly
Barton	Byrne	Cook
Benish	Calvert	Cooper
Bentivolio	Camp	Costa
Bera (CA)	Campbell	Cotton
Bilirakis	Cantor	Courtney
Bishop (GA)	Capito	Cramer
Bishop (NY)	Cárdenas	Crawford
Black	Carson (IN)	Crenshaw
Blackburn	Carter	Cuellar
Bonamici	Cassidy	Culberson
Boustany	Castro (TX)	Cummings
Brady (PA)	Chabot	Daines
Brady (TX)	Clawson (FL)	Davis, Rodney
Braley (IA)	Clay	Delaney
Bridenstine	Cleaver	DelBene
Brooks (AL)	Clyburn	Denham
Brooks (IN)	Coble	Dent

DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzer
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee

NOT VOTING—10

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
Hanabusa

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1526

So the amendment was rejected.

Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms.
DELAURO) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the noes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 221, noes 200,
not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

AYES—221

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Bustos
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick

Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko

Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz

NOES—200

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
Hanabusa

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1529

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 239, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—181

Amash	Gingrey (GA)	Noem
Amodei	Gohmert	Nugent
Bachmann	Goodlatte	Nunes
Bachus	Gosar	Olson
Barr	Gowdy	Palazzo
Barton	Granger	Paulsen
Benishek	Graves (GA)	Pearce
Bentivolio	Griffin (AR)	Perry
Bilirakis	Griffith (VA)	Pittenger
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Pitts
Black	Hall	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Harper	Posey
Boustany	Harris	Price (GA)
Brady (TX)	Hartzler	Ribble
Bridenstine	Hastings (WA)	Rice (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Rigell
Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Broun (GA)	Holding	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Huelskamp	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (MI)
Byrne	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Hurt	Rokita
Camp	Issa	Rooney
Campbell	Jenkins	Ross
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Carter	Jones	Royce
Cassidy	Jordan	Salmon
Chabot	King (IA)	Sanford
Chaffetz	Kingston	Scalise
Clawson (FL)	Kline	Schweikert
Coble	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Coffman	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Lamborn	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Lankford	Simpson
Collins (NY)	Latham	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Latta	Smith (TX)
Cotton	Long	Southerland
Cramer	Lucas	Stewart
Crawford	Luetkemeyer	Stockman
Creshaw	Lummis	Hultgren
Culberson	Marchant	Israel
Daines	Marino	Jeffries
Dent	Massie	Johnson (GA)
DeSantis	McAllister	Johnson (OH)
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy (CA)	
Duncan (TN)	McCarroll	
Ellmers	McClintock	
Farenthold	McHenry	
Fincher	McKeon	
Fleischmann	McMorris	
Fleming	Rodgers	
Flores	Meadows	
Forbes	Messer	
Fortenberry	Mica	
Fox	Miller (FL)	
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	
Gardner	Mullin	
Garrett	Mulvaney	
Gibbs	Neugebauer	

NOES—239

Barber	Blumenauer	Capps
Barletta	Bonamici	Capuano
Barrow (GA)	Brady (PA)	Cárdenas
Bass	Braley (IA)	Carson (IN)
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Cartwright
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Castor (FL)
Bera (CA)	Bustos	Castro (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Chu
Bishop (NY)	Capito	Cicilline

Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Clarke (NY)	Jolly	Price (NC)
Clay	Joyce	Quigley
Cleaver	Kaptur	Rahall
Clyburn	Keating	Reed
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Reichert
Connolly	Kelly (PA)	Renacci
Conyers	Kennedy	Ros-Lehtinen
Cook	Kildee	Roskam
Cooper	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Costa	Kind	Ruiz
Courtney	King (NY)	Runyan
Crowley	Kinzinger (IL)	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Cummings	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Davis (CA)	Lance	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Sanchez, Linda
Davis, Rodney	Larsen (WA)	T.
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
Delaney	Levin	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Lewis	Schiff
DelBene	Lipinski	Schneider
Deutch	LoBiondo	Schock
Diaz-Balart	Loebisack	Schrader
Dingell	Lofgren	Schwartz
Doggett	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
Doyle	Lowey	Scott, David
Duckworth	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Duffy	(NM)	Sewell (AL)
Edwards	Lujan, Ben Ray	Shea-Porter
Ellison	(NM)	Sherman
Engel	Lynch	Shimkus
Enyart	Maffei	Shuster
Eshoo	Maloney,	Sinema
Esty	Carolyn	Sires
Farr	Maloney, Sean	Slaughter
Fattah	Matheson	Smith (NJ)
Fitzpatrick	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Foster	McCollum	Speier
Frankel (FL)	McDermott	Stivers
Fudge	McGovern	Swalwell (CA)
Gabbard	McIntyre	Takano
Gallego	McKinley	Terry
Garamendi	McNerney	Thompson (CA)
Garcia	Meehan	Thompson (MS)
Gerlach	Meeks	Tiberi
Gibson	Meng	Tierney
Graves (MO)	Michaud	Titus
Grayson	Miller, George	Tonko
Green, Al	Moore	Tsongas
Green, Gene	Moran	Turner
Grijalva	Murphy (FL)	Upton
Grimm	Murphy (PA)	Valadao
Gutiérrez	Nadler	Van Hollen
Hahn	Napolitano	Vargas
Hanna	Neal	Veasey
Hastings (FL)	Negrete McLeod	Vela
Heck (NV)	Nolan	Velázquez
Heck (WA)	O'Rourke	Visclosky
Higgins	Owens	Walden
Himes	Pallone	Walz
Hinojosa	Pascrell	Wasserman
Holt	Pastor (AZ)	Schultz
Honda	Payne	Waters
Horsford	Pelosi	Waxman
Hoyer	Perlmutter	Welch
Huffman	Peters (CA)	Whitfield
Stockman	Peters (MI)	Wilson (FL)
Hultgren	Peterson	Yarmuth
Israel	Petri	Young (AK)
Jeffries	Pingree (ME)	
Johnson (GA)	Pocan	
Johnson (OH)		

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt	Hanabusa	Pompeo
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Denham	McCarthy (NY)	Richmond
DesJarlais	Nunnelee	Smith (MO)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1533

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANKFORD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 191, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

AYES—227

Amash	Graves (MO)	Perry
Amodei	Griffin (AR)	Peterson
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Petri
Bachus	Grimm	Pittenger
Barletta	Guthrie	Pitts
Barr	Hall	Poe (TX)
Barton	Hanna	Posey
Benishek	Harper	Price (GA)
Bentivolio	Harris	Rahall
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Reichert
Black	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Blackburn	Hensarling	Ribble
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Holding	Rigell
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)	Roe (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Hurt	Rogers (MI)
Bucshon	Issa	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Jenkins	Rokita
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Jolly	Roskam
Campbell	Jones	Ross
Cantor	Jordan	Rothfus
Carter	Joyce	Royce
Cassidy	Kelly (PA)	Runyan
Chabot	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	Kingston	Salmon
Clawson (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Sanford
Coble	Kline	Scalise
Coffman	Labrador	Schock
Cole	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lankford	Sessions
Cook	Latham	Shimkus
Cotton	Latta	Shuster
Cramer	LoBiondo	Simpson
Crawford	Long	Smith (NE)
Creshaw	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Daines	Lummis	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Stewart
Dent	Marino	Stivers
DeSantis	Massie	Stockman
Diaz-Balart	Matheson	Stutzman
Duffy	McAllister	Terry
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Thornberry
Ellmers	McClintock	Tiberi
Farenthold	McHenry	Tipton
Fincher	McKeon	Turner
Fleischmann	McKinley	Upton
Fleming	McMorris	Valadao
Flores	Rodgers	Wagner
Forbes	Meadows	Walberg
Fortenberry	Meehan	Walden
Fox	Messer	Walorski
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Weber (TX)
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Gardner	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Garrett	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Gibbs	Mullin	Whitfield
Gerlach	Mulvaney	Williams
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Wittman
Goodlatte	Noem	Wolf
Gosar	Nugent	Womack
Gowdy	Nunes	Woodall
Granger	Olson	Yoder
Graves (GA)	Palazzo	Yoho
	Paulsen	Young (AK)
	Pearce	Young (IN)

NOES—191

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia

Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutt er
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schneider
Schrad er
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt
Carney
Denham
DesJarlais
Hanabusa

Hudson
Jackson Lee
King (IA)
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee

Pompeo
Rangel
Richmond
Smith (MO)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1536

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASSIDY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 187, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

AYES—232

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger

Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kingsdon
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce

Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—187

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty

Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)

Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)

Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins

Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke

Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutt er
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrad er
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt
Carney
DeFazio
DesJarlais
Farr

Hanabusa
Jackson Lee
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee
Pompeo

Rangel
Richmond
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1539

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 661;

Adopting House Resolution 661, if ordered.

Both electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 5016, FINANCIAL SERVICES
AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT
APPROPRIATIONS ACT,
2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CON-
SIDERATION OF H.R. 4718, BONUS
DEPRECIATION MODIFIED AND
MADE PERMANENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 661) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4718) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 192, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

YEAS—229

Amash	Cole	Gibson
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Gingrey (GA)
Bachmann	Collins (NY)	Gohmert
Bachus	Conaway	Goodlatte
Barletta	Cook	Gosar
Barr	Cotton	Gowdy
Barton	Cramer	Granger
Benishek	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Bentivolio	Crenshaw	Graves (MO)
Bilirakis	Culberson	Griffin (AR)
Bishop (UT)	Daines	Griffith (VA)
Black	Davis, Rodney	Grimm
Blackburn	Denham	Guthrie
Boustany	Dent	Hall
Brady (TX)	DeSantis	Hanna
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Harper
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Harris
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Broun (GA)	Duncan (TN)	Hastings (WA)
Buchanan	Ellmers	Heck (NV)
Bucshon	Farenthold	Hensarling
Burgess	Fincher	Herrera Beutler
Byrne	Fitzpatrick	Holding
Calvert	Fleischmann	Hudson
Camp	Fleming	Huelskamp
Campbell	Flores	Huizenga (MI)
Cantor	Forbes	Hultgren
Capito	Fortenberry	Hunter
Carter	Fox	Hurt
Cassidy	Franks (AZ)	Issa
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins
Chaffetz	Gardner	Johnson (OH)
Clawson (FL)	Garrett	Johnson, Sam
Coble	Gerlach	Jolly
Coffman	Gibbs	Jones

Jordan	Neugebauer	Sensenbrenner
Joyce	Noem	Sessions
Kelly (PA)	Nugent	Shimkus
King (IA)	Nunes	Shuster
King (NY)	Olson	Simpson
Kingston	Palazzo	Smith (MO)
Kinzinger (IL)	Paulsen	Smith (NE)
Kline	Pearce	Smith (NJ)
Labrador	Perry	Smith (TX)
LaMalfa	Petri	Southerland
Lamborn	Pittenger	Stewart
Lance	Pitts	Stivers
Lankford	Poe (TX)	Stockman
Latham	Posey	Stutzman
Latta	Price (GA)	Terry
LoBiondo	Reed	Thompson (PA)
Long	Reichert	Thornberry
Lucas	Renacci	Tiberi
Luetkemeyer	Ribble	Tipton
Lummis	Rice (SC)	Turner
Marchant	Rigell	Upton
Marino	Roby	Valadao
Massie	Roe (TN)	Wagner
McAllister	Rogers (AL)	Walberg
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Walden
McCaul	Rogers (MI)	Walorski
McClintock	Rohrabacher	Weber (TX)
McHenry	Rokita	Webster (FL)
McKeon	Rooney	Wenstrup
McKinley	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland
McMorris	Roskam	Whitfield
Rodgers	Ross	Williams
Meadows	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)
Meehan	Royce	Wittman
Messer	Runyan	Wolf
Mica	Ryan (WI)	Womack
Miller (FL)	Salmon	Woodall
Miller (MI)	Sanford	Yoder
Miller, Gary	Scalise	Yoho
Mullin	Schock	Young (AK)
Mulvaney	Schweikert	Young (IN)
Murphy (PA)	Scott, Austin	

NAYS—192

Barber	Eshoo	Maffei
Barrow (GA)	Esty	Maloney
Bass	Farr	Carolyn
Beatty	Fattah	Maloney, Sean
Becerra	Foster	Matheson
Bera (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Matsui
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	McCollum
Bishop (NY)	Gabbard	McDermott
Blumenauer	Gallo	McGovern
Bonamici	Garamendi	McIntyre
Brady (PA)	Garcia	McNerney
Braley (IA)	Grayson	Meeks
Brown (FL)	Green, Al	Meng
Brownley (CA)	Green, Gene	Michaud
Bustos	Grijalva	Miller, George
Butterfield	Hahn	Moore
Capps	Hastings (FL)	Moran
Capuano	Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)
Cardenas	Higgins	Nadler
Carson (IN)	Himes	Napolitano
Cartwright	Hinojosa	Neal
Castor (FL)	Holt	Negrete McLeod
Castro (TX)	Honda	Nolan
Chu	Horsford	O'Rourke
Ciilline	Hoyer	Owens
Clark (MA)	Huffman	Pallone
Clarke (NY)	Israel	Pascarell
Clay	Jeffries	Pastor (AZ)
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Cohen	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Connolly	Keating	Peters (CA)
Conyers	Kelly (IL)	Peters (MI)
Cooper	Kennedy	Peterson
Costa	Kildee	Pingree (ME)
Courtney	Kilmer	Pocan
Crowley	Kind	Polis
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kuster	Quigley
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Rahall
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Ruppersberger
Delaney	Levin	Rush
DeLauro	Lewis	Ryan (OH)
DeLenc	Lipinski	Sanchez, Linda
Deutch	Loeb	T.
Dingell	Lofgren	Sanchez, Loretta
Doggett	Lowenthal	Sarbanes
Doyle	Lowe	Schakowsky
Duckworth	Lujan Grisham	Schiff
Edwards	(NM)	Schneider
Ellison	Lujan, Ben Ray	Schrader
Engel	(NM)	Schwartz
Enyart	Lynch	Scott (VA)

Scott, David	Takano	Velázquez
Serrano	Thompson (CA)	Visclosky
Sewell (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Walz
Shea-Porter	Tierney	Wasserman
Sherman	Titus	Schultz
Sinema	Tonko	Waters
Sires	Tsongas	Waxman
Slaughter	Van Hollen	Welch
Smith (WA)	Vargas	Wilson (FL)
Speier	Veasey	Yarmuth
Swalwell (CA)	Vela	

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt	Hanabusa	Pompeo
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rangel
DesJarlais	McCarthy (NY)	Richmond
Gutiérrez	Nunnelee	

□ 1547

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 188, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

YEAS—234

Amash	Duncan (TN)	King (NY)
Amodei	Ellmers	Kingston
Bachmann	Farenthold	Kinzinger (IL)
Bachus	Fincher	Kline
Barber	Fitzpatrick	Labrador
Barletta	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Barr	Fleming	Lamborn
Barton	Flores	Lance
Benishek	Forbes	Lankford
Bentivolio	Fortenberry	Latham
Bilirakis	Fox	Latta
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Black	Frelinghuysen	Long
Blackburn	Gardner	Lucas
Boustany	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Brady (TX)	Gerlach	Lummis
Bridenstine	Gibbs	Marchant
Brooks (AL)	Gibson	Marino
Brooks (IN)	Gingrey (GA)	Massie
Broun (GA)	Gohmert	McAllister
Buchanan	Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)
Bucshon	Gosar	McCaul
Burgess	Gowdy	McClintock
Byrne	Granger	McHenry
Calvert	Graves (GA)	McKeon
Camp	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Campbell	Griffin (AR)	McMorris
Cantor	Griffith (VA)	Rodgers
Capito	Grimm	Meadows
Carson (IN)	Guthrie	Meehan
Carter	Hall	Messer
Cassidy	Hanna	Mica
Chabot	Harper	Miller (FL)
Chaffetz	Harris	Miller (MI)
Clawson (FL)	Hartzler	Miller, Gary
Coble	Hastings (WA)	Mullin
Coffman	Heck (NV)	Mulvaney
Cole	Hensarling	Murphy (FL)
Collins (GA)	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)
Collins (NY)	Holding	Neugebauer
Conaway	Hudson	Noem
Cook	Huelskamp	Nugent
Costa	Huizenga (MI)	Nunes
Cotton	Hultgren	Olson
Cramer	Hunter	Palazzo
Crawford	Hurt	Paulsen
Crenshaw	Issa	Pearce
Culberson	Jenkins	Perry
Daines	Johnson (OH)	Petri
Davis, Rodney	Johnson, Sam	Pittenger
Denham	Jolly	Pitts
Dent	Jones	Poe (TX)
DeSantis	Jordan	Posey
Diaz-Balart	Joyce	Price (GA)
Duffy	Kelly (PA)	Reed
Duncan (SC)	King (IA)	Reichert

Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock

Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner

Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—188

Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al

NOT VOTING—10

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
Hanabusa

□ 1553

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 641 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4923.

Will the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1555

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mrs. BLACK (Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 59, line 20.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTON

Mr. BARTON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 508.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C.10101 et seq.), the Secretary of Energy is authorized, in the current fiscal year and subsequent fiscal years, to conduct a pilot program, through 1 or more private sector partners, to license, construct, and operate 1 or more government or privately owned consolidated storage facilities to provide interim storage as needed for spent nuclear fuel and high level radioactive waste, with priority for storage given to spent nuclear fuel located on sites without an operating nuclear reactor.

(b) REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue a request for proposals for cooperative agreements—

(1) to obtain any license necessary from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the construction of 1 or more consolidated storage facilities;

(2) to demonstrate the safe transportation of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste, as applicable; and

(3) to demonstrate the safe storage of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste, as applicable, at the 1 or more consolidated storage facilities pending the construction and operation of deep geologic disposal capacity for the permanent disposal of the spent nuclear fuel.

(c) CONSENT-BASED APPROVAL.—Prior to siting a consolidated storage facility pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement to host the facility with—

(1) the State;

(2) each unit of local government within the jurisdiction of which the facility is proposed to be located; and

(3) each affected Indian tribe.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—In executing this section, the Secretary shall comply with—

(1) all licensing requirements and regulations of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; and

(2) all other applicable laws (including regulations).

(e) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—Prior to choosing a site for the construction of a consolidated storage facility under this section, the Secretary shall conduct 1 or more public hearings in the vicinity of each potential site and in at least 1 other location within the State in which the site is located to solicit public comments and recommendations.

(f) USE OF NUCLEAR WASTE FUND.—The Secretary may make expenditures from the Nuclear Waste Fund to carry out this section, subject to appropriations.

Mr. BARTON (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. Madam Chair, at the end of the dialogue on this amendment, it is my intention to withdraw it, and I want the House to know that.

As we all know, we have the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 that stipulates that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government, through the Department of Energy, to accept all high-level nuclear waste that has been generated by our civilian reactors.

This has not been done, even though we have a law that says it should be done. There is a permanent repository that is located in the State of Nevada.

The citizens of that State have serious reservations about accepting high-level waste in their State, and as a consequence, they have managed, through various bills over the years, to prevent that facility from going forward.

The amendment that I have before the body today would authorize a pilot program through the Department of Energy, on a competitive basis and its being consent-based by State, to allow interim storage at one or more facilities.

The money would come from the nuclear waste fund from which we have collected over \$15 billion. This amendment would not preclude Yucca Mountain, in any way, from being the permanent repository.

It would allow any State in the Nation that wished to submit a proposal to the Secretary of Energy within 120 days, if my amendment were to become

law; then, on a competitive basis, the Secretary of Energy, after holding public hearings, would make a determination that one or more sites in the country could accept this waste on an interim basis.

I think this is a good amendment. It would cut the Gordian knot that has constrained us for over 30 years, and if we were to be allowed to vote on it, I am absolutely certain the House would pass it.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), my cosponsor on the minority side.

□ 1600

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague on the Energy and Commerce Committee and my good Texas friend.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment and will place my full statement into the RECORD.

The amendment I am offering with my friend Congressman JOE BARTON would authorize the Energy Department to start a pilot nuclear waste program.

Congress, back in 1982, passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, directing DOE and NRC to open a permanent repository for our Nation's spent nuclear fuel. Over three decades later, America is still without a repository, leaving tens of thousands of nuclear waste vulnerable to attacks of terror and other catastrophes.

The reasons behind this failure are well-known, and it is imperative that this Congress and the administration act to open a safe and permanent storage facility. Until that day, we must find interim storage to ensure that the 70,000 tons of spent fuel sitting in our Nation's nuclear plants are safe from harm's way.

The pilot program authorized in this amendment would be paid for by funds already available in the nuclear waste fund and would direct DOE to open a pilot facility only after it was found to be safe by NRC, has gained the consent of the State's Governor, each unit of local government within the jurisdiction and affected Indian tribes, and heard from the general public.

Given the nearly \$30 billion available in the nuclear waste fund, the growing inventory of spent nuclear fuel, and the inherent hazards connected with nuclear waste, I urge my colleagues to join with Congressman BARTON and me to authorize this program.

Madam Chairman, I am also in agreement. I agree with withdrawing the amendment, but somewhere, this Congress needs to address our nuclear waste disposal and storage issue.

I thank my colleague for the time.

Mr. BARTON. Madam Chair, could I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time at this point in time.

The CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Idaho continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I just want to say, it is my understanding the gentleman is going to withdraw the amendment, so we are not going to have to insist on the point of order.

I just want to assure both my friends from Texas that this is an issue that this body needs to deal with. We just had two votes in the last hour that were a pretty good indication that this body supports long-term storage of high-level nuclear waste.

It is an issue that we have seen linger in this Congress now, well, for the last number of decades. It needs to be resolved. I am one that believes, as you do, I think—I know—that the authorizing committee needs to deal with this forthwith; and I want to give the assurance to you and all of our colleagues that, as the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I want to continue to work on this issue on a bipartisan basis.

For me, I have got two nuclear plants in my district. Both facilities, in fact, have run out of room in their pools. They are going to be storing it on-site.

We have got a number of sites around the country that are closed at this point, and they are needing to send their high-level nuclear waste to one safe place. That is what the Yucca Mountain bill did that we passed, that President Reagan signed into law back in the eighties.

There is a lot of discussion, particularly on the Senate side, on an interim storage site. I know that some States like Texas would very much like to participate in such a program. My concern with that approach is this, that I don't want to see that move without a permanent, full-time site like Yucca be left in the ditch, that, in fact, we might see, ultimately, the two combined.

That is not an approach that we are going to deal with on this appropriation bill but, rather, an authorization bill that certainly I would like to see happen. I know that the chairman of that subcommittee, Mr. SHIMKUS, is on board with, very much, the same thoughts. I would like to think that in the next Congress, when we have got some new faces perhaps on both sides of the House and the Senate, that we will be able to move a bipartisan bill to, in fact, deal with both long-term and short-term in terms of interim, and I look forward to being a party to try and get those two groups together.

So I would ask the two gentlemen from Texas, particularly you, Mr. BARTON, if you would withdraw the amendment knowing that we will, in fact, deal with this on another day, not today.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. Does the gentleman from Idaho continue to reserve a point of order?

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. BARTON. Madam Chair, let me reiterate, before I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment, that, one, it is obviously bipartisan. Two, I think it would pass the House overwhelmingly, because, as the chairman of the full committee just said, we have had two votes in the last hour that were 5-1 in favor of disposing of high-level waste. I would say you could say those were votes in favor of disposing of it at Yucca Mountain, but certainly we have the votes for a permanent repository.

The amendment before the body at this moment is a pilot program. It is for interim storage. It in no way would preclude any effort to fund and develop the permanent repository at Yucca. And if the State of Nevada wanted to, they could compete for the interim storage and I think, in all probability, might decide to do so.

So I would hope that sometime in this Congress through the appropriation process with the other body or, as the full committee chairman has just promised, in the next Congress through the normal regular order authorization process that we deal both with interim storage and permanent storage.

And I think I have the chairman's commitment to do that. Is that correct?

Mr. UPTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. I look forward to working with you on both of those accounts and move it to regular order through the authorization process. Certainly that is an issue that I want to see our committee deal with in the next Congress for sure.

Mr. BARTON. Reclaiming my time, I want to thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. SIMPSON, for his courtesy and his staff's courtesy, the ranking member, Ms. KAPTUR, the full committee, Mr. ROGERS and his staff.

I will submit a letter for the RECORD from the Governor of Texas dated July 3 in support of my amendment.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,

July 3, 2014.

DEAR TEXAS CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION: After President Obama abandoned any further development of Yucca Mountain and Congress ceased all funding in 2011, the country must look for new solutions to the long-term issue of safe and secure handling of high level radioactive waste (HLW). Early in 2013 the U.S. Department of Energy announced that it was looking into alternative, permanent disposal solutions to replace the proposed storage facility at Yucca Mountain. By its own estimations, a permanent HLW disposal solution will not be available until 2048.

An amendment proposed by Congressman Joe Barton authorizes the Secretary of Energy to conduct a pilot program that would

provide interim storage of spent nuclear fuel and HLW, with the priority for storage given to spent nuclear fuel located on sites without an operating nuclear reactor. This option could demonstrate how this waste can be transported and stored in a secure and viable manner, providing a step toward a long-term solution to this ongoing issue.

With or without a long-term solution for disposing of HLW, implementation of interim facilities is needed. I believe it is time for the Congress to act and ensure that the United States has a safe and secure solution for HLW, and I support this effort by Congressman Barton.

Sincerely,

RICK PERRY,
Governor.

Mr. BARTON. Madam Chair, I would, at this point in time, ask unanimous consent to withdraw the Barton-Green amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Chair, on May 24, 2011, President Obama issued a Memorandum on Federal Fleet Performance that requires all new light-duty vehicles in the Federal fleet to be alternate fuel vehicles, such as hybrid, electric, natural gas, or biofuel, by December 31, 2015.

My amendment echoes the Presidential Memorandum by prohibiting funds in the Energy and Water Appropriations Act from being used to lease or purchase new light-duty vehicles except in accord with the President's memorandum.

This amendment has been supported by the majority and minority on appropriations bills eight times over the past few years, and I hope it will receive similar support today.

Our transportation sector is by far the largest reason we send \$600 billion per year to hostile nations to pay for oil at ever-increasing costs. But America doesn't need to be dependent on foreign sources of oil for transportation fuel. Alternative technologies exist today that, when implemented broadly, will allow any alternative fuel to be used in America's automotive fleet.

The Federal Government operates the largest fleet of light-duty vehicles in America. According to GSA, there are over 660,000 vehicles in the Federal

fleet. So, by supporting a diverse array of vehicle technologies in our Federal fleet, we will encourage development of domestic energy resources, including biomass, natural gas, agricultural waste, hydrogen, renewable electricity, methanol, and ethanol.

When I was in Brazil a few years ago, I saw how they diversified their fuel by greatly expanding their use of ethanol. When people drove to a gas station, they saw what a gallon of gasoline would cost and what an equivalent amount of ethanol would cost and could decide which was better for them.

I want the same choices for Americans. That is why the gentlewoman from Florida, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and I have submitted a bill which would provide for every fuel car built in America to be a flex-fuel car, which would cost less than \$100 per car. If they can do this in Brazil, we can do it here. We can educate people on using alternative fuels and let consumers decide which is best for them.

So, in conclusion, expanding the role these resources play in our transportation economy will help break the leverage over Americans held by foreign government-controlled oil companies, and it will increase our Nation's domestic security and protect consumers from price spikes and shortages in the world oil markets.

I ask that my colleagues support the Engel amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am willing to accept this amendment, and I thank the gentleman for offering it.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman for doing that.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to implement or enforce section 430.32(x) of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(2) to implement or enforce the standards established by the tables contained in section 325(i)(1)(B) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6295(i)(1)(B)) with respect to BPAR incandescent reflector lamps, BR incandescent reflector lamps, and ER incandescent reflector lamps.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, today's amendment is to maintain current law.

Since the passage in 2007 of the Energy Security Act, I have heard from tens of thousands of constituents about how the language of the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act takes away consumer choice when deciding which types of lightbulbs to purchase and place in their homes.

While the government has passed energy efficiency standards in other realms over the years, never have they moved the bar so high and lowered the standard so drastically. It is to a point where technology is still years away from making lightbulbs that are compliant with the law at a price point the average American can afford.

Opponents to my amendment will claim that the 2007 language does not ban the incandescent bulb. I would stipulate that that is true. But it does ban the sale of the 100-watt, the 60-watt, and the 45-watt bulb.

The replacement bulbs are far from economically efficient, even if they are energy efficient. A family living paycheck to paycheck can't afford to replace every single bulb in their house at \$25 to \$35 a bulb, even if those bulbs do last 20 years. And 20 years from now, who knows if the technology is going to change again, and maybe the Congress will have them change their lightbulbs again.

The economics of the lightbulb mandate are only part of the story. With the expansion of Federal powers undertaken by President Obama and the Democrats in Congress during the first 2 years of the Obama administration, Americans realized just how far the Constitution's Commerce Clause has been manipulated from its original intent. The lightbulb mandate is a perfect example of this.

The Commerce Clause was intended by our Founding Fathers to be a limitation on Federal authority, not a catchall nod to allow for any topic to be regulated by Washington that Washington felt was in the people's best interest. Indeed, it is clear that the Founding Fathers never intended this clause to be used to allow the Federal Government to regulate and pass mandates on consumer products that do not pose a risk to health or safety.

The Congress should be on the side of the average American. The Congress should be on the side of the consumer. The Congress should be on the side of consumer choice. If new, energy-efficient lightbulbs save money and are better for the environment, we should trust the American people to make the choice on their own to move toward these bulbs. We should not force these bulbs on the American people.

□ 1615

The bottom line is, the Federal Government has no business taking away the freedom of Americans to choose whatever they wish to put in their homes.

I will add that recently lightbulb manufacturers in this country have

claimed that because of the stopgap provision in the 2007 law, if we continue to prevent the Department of Energy from promulgating rules pursuant to these provisions, the manufacturers will be forced to stop manufacturing compliant incandescent bulbs. But this is an argument to repeal the 2007 language in its entirety, not to force its implementation. We should not allow a stopgap trigger in the law to extort us from allowing bad policy to move forward.

This exact amendment has been accepted for the past 3 years by voice vote and has been included in the annual appropriations legislation, signed into law by President Obama each year since its first inclusion. It allows consumers to continue to have a choice. It allows consumers to continue to have a say about what they put in their homes. It is common sense. It is time we trust average Americans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I oppose this rider, which would block the Department of Energy from implementing or enforcing commonsense energy efficiency standards for lightbulbs. This rider was a bad idea 3 years ago when it was first offered, and it is even more unsupportable today.

Every claim made by proponents of this rider has been proven wrong. Mr. BURGESS told us that the energy efficiency standards would ban incandescent lightbulbs. That has been simply false. You can go to the store today and see shelves of modern energy-efficient incandescent lightbulbs that meet the standard. They are the same as the old bulbs, except that they last longer, use less electricity, and save consumers money.

We have heard for years that the energy efficiency standards restrict consumer choice. We even heard it again a minute ago. Well, if you have shopped for lightbulbs lately, you know this isn't true. Modern incandescent bulbs, compact fluorescent lightbulbs, and LEDs of every shape, size, and color are now available. Consumers have never had more choice. The efficiency standards spurred innovation that dramatically expanded options for consumers.

Critics of the efficiency standard claimed that they would cost consumers money. In fact, the opposite is true. When the standards are in full effect, the average American family will save about \$100 every year. That is \$13 billion in savings nationwide every year. But this rider threatens those savings. That is why the Consumer Federation of America and the Consumers Union oppose this anti-consumer amendment.

Here is the reality: the 2007 consensus energy efficiency standards for lightbulbs were enacted with bipartisan support, and they continue to enjoy overwhelming industry support.

U.S. manufacturers are already meeting the efficiency standards. The effect of this rider is to allow foreign manufacturers to sell old, inefficient lightbulbs in the United States that violate these efficiency standards. That is unfair to domestic manufacturers who have invested millions of dollars in U.S. plants to make efficient bulbs that meet the standards. That is following our law.

Why on Earth would we want to pass a rider that favors foreign manufacturers who ignore our laws and penalizes U.S. manufacturers who are following our laws?

But it gets even worse. The rider now poses an additional threat to U.S. manufacturing. The bipartisan 2007 energy bill required the Department of Energy to establish updated lightbulb efficiency standards by January 1, 2017. It also provided that if final updated standards are not issued by then, a more stringent standard of 45 lumens per watt automatically takes effect. Incandescent lightbulbs currently cannot meet this backstop standard. This rider blocks DOE from issuing the required efficiency standards and ensures that the backstop will kick in. Ironically, it is this rider that could effectively ban the incandescent lightbulb.

The Burgess rider directly threatens existing lightbulb manufacturing jobs in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois. It would stifle innovation and punish companies that have invested in domestic manufacturing. This rider aims to reverse years of technological progress only to kill jobs, increase electricity bills for our constituents, and worsen pollution.

There is nothing in the Constitution that says that this rider makes sense, despite the arguments we have heard from the proponent of this rider.

It is time to choose common sense over rigid ideology. It is time to listen to the manufacturing companies, consumer groups, and efficiency advocates who all argue that this rider is harmful.

I urge all Members to vote "no" on the Burgess lightbulb rider, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, I think columnist George Will said it best back in December of 2007 when the Energy Independence and Security Act passed. He said: Look, the United States Congress has two jobs—defend the borders and deliver the mail, and instead, they have spent their time outlawing Thomas Edison's greatest invention.

I urge Members to support the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the

amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term "Fair Labor Standards Act."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Minnesota and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, today I am offering an amendment that is very simple. Basically, it is one of those issues that I think both conservatives and liberals and Republicans and Democrats ought to be able to get together and agree on. And that is, if a hardworking American earns a penny, they ought to get that penny.

So what the amendment does, it says that if there is a Federal contractor who has a demonstrated, recorded, proven history of wage theft, is in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, then they will not be able to participate in this appropriation.

This amendment addresses a very serious problem. I would like to bring to the House's attention that the Economic Policy Institute found that in total, the average low-wage worker loses a stunning \$2,634 per year in unpaid wages, representing about 15 percent of their earned income. Another report by the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee of the United States Senate revealed that 32 percent of the largest Department of Labor penalties for wage theft were levied against Federal contractors. Similarly, a National Employment Law Project study found that about 21 percent of Federal contract workers were not paid overtime, and 11 percent were forced to work off the clock.

Now, we might debate taxes. We might debate how high the minimum wage should be. But I know this House, this body, as a whole, believes that hardworking people should get the money that they have worked for.

Also, the Federal Government, the government is the largest spender in the world, I think, when you add it all up. And anyone who would want a contract with the Federal Government should be a contractor who is willing to uphold the best, most ethical business standards.

We, as a body, should appropriate our money to those businesses that believe in paying the workers on time, no matter what that agreed amount of money is.

Madam Chair, let me just conclude by saying that I think this is an important amendment. I urge adoption. And as we, as a body, work hard to provide opportunity for all Americans, particularly those who work for Federal contractors. I think one thing we can do is to support this amendment today and send an important signal that a penny worked for is a penny that must be paid.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated to provide funds to any entity (as defined in section 101 of title 11 of the United States Code) that commenced a case under title 11 of the United States Code in fiscal year 2013, in fiscal year 2014, or before the date such funds would otherwise be so obligated in fiscal year 2015.

Mr. BURGESS (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to protect taxpayers from losing any more money, since the Department of Energy's track record of granting money to entities teetering on the brink of bankruptcy is far from stellar.

Since President Obama ramped up spending at the Department of Energy in order to push a political agenda, the Department of Energy, first under Secretary Chu and now under Secretary Moniz, has lost hundreds of millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars that the taxpayer will never see again.

Moreover, over the past decade, the Department of Energy has given the United States Enrichment Corporation billions of taxpayer funds, with absolutely nothing to show for it. Last year, we discussed the funding that was earmarked for the United States Enrichment Corporation in this very appropriations bill, the Energy and Water Appropriations bill. And this body was given assurances, assurances that, first off, this would be the last installment of Federal funding for USEC and, sec-

ond, that USEC was now doing a stellar job and was nearing completion of the tests being done at its American Centrifuge Project facility and that the concerns over the loss of taxpayer funds were overblown and unwarranted.

Madam Chairman, unfortunately, both of those assertions have proven to be untrue. Not only does the underlying bill contain an additional \$96 million for the United States Enrichment Corporation, but that corporation can no longer be considered to be on solid financial footing, having declared bankruptcy earlier this year.

So it begs the question, why are Republicans in this body providing earmarked funds for bankrupt companies? When the Department of Energy took over operations at the American Centrifuge Project, through its Oak Ridge National Laboratory, many of us had high hopes of how the facility would be run in the future. But those hopes were dashed when the Department of Energy announced that the United States Enrichment Corporation would continue to operate the facility as a subcontractor, essentially maintaining the status quo, a status quo that historically had proven to be inoperable.

Along with now-Senator MARKEY, I requested the Government Accountability Office to look into the Department of Energy's actions with regard to the United States Enrichment Corporation, providing uranium tails to the company while simultaneously harming the uranium mining industry in many of our Western States.

The Government Accountability Office, in the first of two reports this month, found the Department of Energy had been taking steps with regard to the United States Enrichment Corporation that far exceeded its legal authority.

□ 1630

Those of us who have been involved with this issue were hardly surprised by this conclusion, but the report served to undermine all of the claims that supporters of the United States Enrichment Corporation have made about the national importance of the American Centrifuge Project facility.

Now, the Government Accountability Office is scheduled to release its second report later this summer, which concerns the claims that the United States Enrichment Corporation's existence is necessary for national security.

It is clear, however, from the first GAO report, that the Department of Energy's actions have been taken in direct contradiction to Federal law. This must stop. Any further taxpayer money placed in this direction is sure to be wasted.

Madam Chairman, the Department of Energy's track record of giving money to bankrupt companies is abysmal. The House today has a chance to stand up for the American taxpayer and prevent further funding from being provided to companies that simply cannot deliver.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I must insist on my point of order.

I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Chair, I do.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BURGESS. I would merely point out that we have had this discussion on the Energy and Water Appropriations bill year in and year out on this issue.

The fact of the matter is the Department of Energy wasted money when it came to Solyndra. We should not support the additional wasting of money simply because it is nuclear energy that is involved at this point.

Realistically, this should have been stopped last year or the year before. The fact that it has not been stopped is not something that we, as Republicans, can continue to justify. This activity needs to cease. To defeat this measure on a technicality is the wrong approach.

I would encourage the Chair to allow this amendment to come forward to a floor vote. I believe it would be supported by the Members.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a determination of whether certain entities have commenced bankruptcy cases.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals:

(A) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal

or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(B) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in subsection (A); or

(C) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Chair, this amendment is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill that has been considered under an open rule during this Congress.

It is also identical to the amendment that I offered to last year's Energy and Water Appropriations bill, which passed by a voice vote.

My amendment expands the list of parties with whom the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of those contractors. It is my hope that this amendment remains uncontroversial—as it has been—and, again, will be passed unanimously by the House.

Mr. SIMPSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. We are happy to accept this amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON. Thank you very much. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to regulate activities identified in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 404(f)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A), (C)) or to limit the exemption in section 404(f)(1)(A) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A)) to established or ongoing operations.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chairman, we have heard quite a bit about the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers' overreach regarding waters of the United States. In a preview of just how little regard these entities have for Congress

and the law, they have already drastically overstepped the limits Congress has placed on their power.

Section 404(f) of the Clean Water Act explicitly exempts certain activities from regulation, including normal agricultural activities like plowing fields, planting and harvesting crops, and maintaining irrigation and drainage ditches. Congress made these exemptions clear when the act was passed.

Unfortunately, the EPA and Army Corps are, as usual, using creative interpretations of the law in an effort to regulate activities that are clearly exempt from their control. We have seen Federal agencies go after farmers simply for changing crops or improving their irrigation systems, with absolutely no authority to do so.

The exemption on ag activities, in section 404(f)(1) of the Clean Water Act, reads as follows:

Normal farming, silviculture, and ranching activities, such as plowing, seeding, cultivating, minor drainage, harvesting for the production of food, fiber, and forest products or upland soil and water conservation practices is not prohibited or otherwise subject to regulation.

Madam Chair, this is as clear as it can be. These activities are exempt from regulation. However, according to the corps permitting guidance to farmers and ranchers, to qualify, these exempt activities: must be a part of an established ongoing farming, silviculture, or ranching operation. An operation is no longer established when the area on which it was conducted has been converted to another use or has lain idle.

Again, the Army Corps' own words:

If the current use of a property is for growing corn, the exemption does not apply if future activities would involve conversion to an orchard or vineyards.

Nowhere in the law does a requirement that farm work be "ongoing" or "established" exist. Nowhere in the law is a prohibition on changing crops mentioned.

Madam Chair, my amendment simply directs the corps to follow the law as Congress has written it, to stop attempting to expand its reach based on fictional authority. This House unanimously passed similar language to rein in the corps last year.

Let us remind these agencies that we write the law, not unknown Federal bureaucrats, and that the law applies not just to average Americans, but to the Federal Government as well.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because it is not necessary. It does not achieve the stated intent. Contrary to a lot of misinformation—and much of it deliberate, I am afraid—that has been circulated, farmers do not need a Corps of Engineers or even an EPA permit to dig a ditch, to till a field, to create a reservoir, or to irrigate their fields.

Congress clarified this issue more than 35 years ago when it passed the 1977 amendments to the Clean Water Act. Those amendments established a well-reasoned and practical approach that ensured far-reaching protections over the Nation's waters, but also ensured that practical day-to-day operations of farmers, of ranchers, of foresters, and a host of other industrial sectors could continue without the need for Clean Water Act regulation.

Section 404(f) of the 1977 law created a list of "activity-based" exemptions for normal farming, ranching, and forestry activities, but it also included safeguards to ensure that these exempted activities were not exploited by large-scale commercial interests.

I would also like to register my strong opposition to other attacks against the Clean Water Act that are already a part of this bill, and I refer specifically to sections 105 and 106.

Section 105 blocks the Corps of Engineers from updating regulations pertaining to the definitions of "fill material" for the purposes of the Clean Water Act, and section 106 prevents the corps from finalizing its proposed regulation clarifying Federal jurisdiction.

Section 105 protects the work of some attorneys in the George W. Bush administration, who found a clever way to allow mining waste to be dumped into rivers and streams without a rigorous environmental review process.

They simply changed the definition of fill material to include "rock, sand, soil, clay, plastics, construction debris, wood chips, and overburden from mining or other excavation activities."

What had once been a permit process intended to allow quick approval of construction projects like bridges and roads—where raising the bottom elevation of a water body or converting an area into dry land was unavoidable—it became a green light for mountaintop mining removal, where an entire mountaintop could be dumped into a stream valley; and since this clever change in definition occurred, more than 2,000 miles of streams have been buried under mining waste.

The environmental and health consequences have been shocking. People living near mountaintop-removed mines are 50 percent more likely to die of cancer and 42 percent more likely to be born with birth defects compared with other people in Appalachia.

Section 106 is another outrage that has been facilitated by interest groups with deliberately misleading statements.

The corps does need to clarify its authority because there is a lot of confusion as a result of two Supreme Court rulings, and the proposed rule clarifies that.

Most seasonal and rain-dependent streams are protected. Wetlands near rivers and streams are protected. Other types of waters will be evaluated through a case-specific analysis. That makes sense.

The corps has encouraged recommendations from the public for how best to determine whether a water

body has significant connection to downstream waters, but we have to bear in mind that 59 percent of all stream miles in the lower 48 States fall into the category of intermittent or ephemeral.

They only exist for part of the year, yet they receive 40 percent of all individual wastewater discharges. More than 117 million Americans get some of their drinking water from those streams that don't flow year round.

So including this rider to block the corps' rule will only ensure that the confusion continues and that these sources of drinking water remain at increased risk of pollution.

With rising temperatures, more severe droughts, and climate change, protection of our waters and wetlands are more important than ever. We need clarity, not more confusion, and this amendment generates more confusion, and so it should be opposed.

Madam Chairwoman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMALFA. I appreciate the comments and thoughts from my colleague from Virginia there.

That said, on this amendment, not the catchall on the whole bill here, we are sticking to the exemptions that have been provided for in the law by Congress for farming activities, and we do have the need for this amendment because the enforcement by the Army Corps is happening out in the field in my own district, even on these issues.

We have a screen shot right here from the Army Corps' Web site that lists some of the things I mentioned earlier, as I said, that these activities must be part of an ongoing operation or that there cannot be a crop change without requirements put forth by the Army Corps, giving you permission or denying that permission.

So it is, indeed, necessary because there is overzealous regulation and enforcement of something that doesn't exist in the law as passed duly by the Congress representing the people of the United States.

□ 1645

As I mentioned a bit earlier, once again, this House did unanimously pass similar language on this issue last year, so I would ask to have that support of the U.S. House once again to simply allow farmers to do what they would be doing ongoing and planning to do and have done for many generations all over this country except for a reinterpretation by, in a lot of cases, out-of-control bureaucrats that have a different agenda.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MORAN. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Of the funds made available by title III under the heading "Atomic Energy Defense Activities—National Nuclear Security Administration—Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation", not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the congressional defense committees (as defined in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code) a report that includes an analysis of alternatives with respect to using the existing infrastructure at the Savannah River Site of the Department of Energy, including existing mixed oxide facilities, to conduct an alternative method for meeting the nuclear disposition requirements of the United States. Such report shall include—

(1) a full description of alternatives considered, including not less than two proposals described in subsection (b);

(2) a comparison of the costs and benefits of each such alternative, including an analysis of trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives;

(3) the identification of the cost and risk of critical technology elements associated with each such alternative, including technology maturity, integration risk, manufacturing feasibility, and demonstration needs;

(4) identification of the cost and risk of additional capital asset and infrastructure capabilities required to support production and certification of each alternative; and

(5) a life-cycle cost estimate for the alternative selected that details the overall cost, scope, and schedule planning assumptions.

(b) In order to obtain alternatives to analyze in the report under subsection (a), the Secretary of Energy shall issue a formal request for proposals for contractors to submit a formal proposal for effective plutonium disposition methods that are alternative to the mixed oxide process, giving consideration to existing capabilities and infrastructure at the Savannah River Site.

Mr. GARAMENDI (during the reading). Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, during the fifties and sixties, we were engaged in what was known as the cold war. We could not build nuclear weapons fast enough, and we surely built a lot of them. Beginning in the eighties

and on into the nineties, we got a little more sane. We and Russia and others became somewhat more sane about what to do with our nuclear weapons, and we began to dismantle many of the nuclear weapons we had, as did Russia.

In the nineties, an agreement was reached between the United States and Russia on the disposition—that is, the ultimate disposition and disposal—of the unused, unnecessary plutonium that both the United States and Russia held in their various stockpiles. That was a good thing. You don't want this stuff lying around. You don't want people to get their hands on it, particularly terrorist organizations. So there was a common understanding between Russia and the United States on the disposal of this unused, unnecessary, and extraordinarily dangerous material. The United States undertook to do this in a facility in South Carolina known as the MOX facility, and we have been at it since the late nineties, putting together a facility.

It hasn't gone well. In fact, it has gone very, very badly; and in the recent last 2 or 3 years, the administration has decided that this is not going to work and that the facility as designed should be put in cold storage and there should be a new way of dealing with this issue.

This amendment would instruct the Department of Energy to undertake a very quick and, in my view, a very appropriate process of going out to those entities and businesses and others around this Nation that can find a way of disposing of this very dangerous plutonium, and do it quickly. It calls for a 6-month process in which the Department of Energy would ask for requests for proposals from qualified companies to dispose of this, including the company that presently does it, AREVA, a French company that is currently operating the facility, have them come forward with a redo of their proposal, can they do it, and other companies. I know of perhaps two that can come forward. Get this thing underway so we can once again carry out our commitment in a treaty with Russia to dispose of our plutonium material.

This does not negate the South Carolina facility. In fact, it would hold the South Carolina facility in place and probably lead to the continuation of that facility, perhaps in a new modality, to dispose of the plutonium. That is what it does. It short-circuits—that is, shortens—the time in which the Department of Energy is already moving to do this.

Under their present proposal, I would suggest it would probably be a decade before they decide what to do. But they need a kick in the pants, which this amendment does; get out there, go to the companies that know how to do this, and get it done. It is in the interest of the United States and in the interest of Russia to dispose of this unnecessary, unused plutonium. If we don't move forward this way, we are looking at a decade, in my estimation,

a decade before the Department of Energy is willing to make a decision.

So that is what the amendment does. I suspect I am going to get a point of order here, but I would like all of us to consider the alternative of not doing this. If we don't take a program such as I am proposing here, we are going to wind up with this thing just lingering out there, a huge fight with South Carolina saying we want to go forward with AREVA; AREVA is not working; on and on and on.

So I ask for an "aye" vote on the amendment and a foregoing of this point of order so we might, as the House of Representatives, take up this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I insist on my point of order.

Madam Chairwoman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rules states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment imposes additional duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Yes, I do.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, I guess I don't understand the suggested ruling. We are spending a pile of money here. We are going to spend, I don't know, some \$12 billion on the path we are on. The bill itself proposes to spend money to keep this project going. The administration says we can't go, it is not working, don't do it.

All my amendment does is to tell the Department of Energy, get on with what you need to do anyway; that is, figure out how to do this. It doesn't spend any more money. In fact, it would spend a whole lot less money than in the present drafting of this legislation, and it doesn't change law at all.

All it does is it directs the Department of Energy to do something, and it specifies how it should be done. That doesn't change law. Well, this whole thing is a law, so the bill itself changes law. So this simply directs how they should carry out their action for which they already have money.

Fine, avoid the issue. Let this thing linger, let it fester and rot, and do nothing. And wait 10 years with this plutonium there while the Department of Energy does what it does best which is to contemplate the future rather than getting things done.

Now we will take up the point of order, and this amendment would fail on a point of order. I would suggest to anybody who cares to listen, this issue

has to be dealt with. This amendment does not select a winner or loser and it doesn't change the fundamental underlying law that we have put in place.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair finds that this amendment imposes new duties on the Secretary of Energy.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following.

SEC. ____ . SACRAMENTO RIVER SETTLEMENT CONTRACTS.

None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Bureau of Reclamation to terminate, or implement, administer, or enforce the termination of, the existing Sacramento River Settlement Contracts before the resolution of *Natural Resources Defense Council, et al. v. Jewell, et al.* (9th Cir. Case No. 0917661 and USDC E.D. Cal. Case No. 05-cv-01207-LJO-GSA) through decision, dismissal, withdrawal or settlement.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I reserve a point of order against this amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, this language in this amendment will hold the Sacramento River settlement contracts in place until issues associated with the litigation or renewal of the contracts are settled. Maintaining these contracts is critically important to the effective operation of the Central Valley Project and efficient delivery of water north and south of the delta.

The settlement contracts are foundational to the CVP and provide vital stability that benefits the Bureau of Reclamation, agricultural and municipal and industrial water users, the environment, the California State water project and its beneficiaries.

The language does not prejudice the disposition of the ongoing litigation; it simply ensures stability until such issues are resolved.

The settlement contracts, originally entered into by the Bureau in 1964 and renewed in 2005, allowed the United States to properly distribute the Sacramento River water rights and provide operational stability for the CVP. Without these contracts in place and full compliance with their terms, the underlying right to divert water from the Sacramento River will be called into question, potentially creating instability statewide. The settlement

contractors would continue to divert water under their historic rights, but will begin to do so earlier in the year and during critical months. In addition, they would not be required to compensate the United States for any of the water they divert. This would cost the Treasury approximately \$12 million in lost revenue.

Moreover, the settlement contractors would no longer be obligated to schedule their water diversions with the U.S. This would result, at a minimum, in an inability to operate the CVP in an efficient manner, causing uncertainty and instability throughout the Central Valley Project and the State water project, which serve a combined 23 million people.

Finally, the contract supplies available for diversion under the existing SRS contracts were assumed in all base and future studies used in the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service 2008 biological opinion pertaining to the delta smelt.

The Ninth Circuit recently confirmed the validity of that biological opinion, as urged by the U.S. and NRDC. Accordingly, continuing these contracts under their existing terms pending the final outcome of the NRDC v. Jewell litigation would have no adverse effect on delta smelt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. Does the gentlewoman from Ohio continue to reserve her point of order?

Ms. KAPTUR. I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Chair, I have great respect for my friend from the Sacramento Valley and the water users he represents, but I must rise in opposition to this amendment. However well-intentioned, it has two fatal flaws. The first is that it is completely unnecessary. Second, it directly interferes with the Federal court's ability to administer the law.

So let's start with the first one, the unnecessary part. It is true that the Court of Appeals ruled in favor of the plaintiffs in this pending litigation because these long-term Sacramento River contracts were signed on the basis of an invalidated biological opinion. But what my colleagues should know is that no party in this ongoing litigation is seeking to terminate water deliveries, nor is anybody asking for the immediate alteration or interruption of deliveries. The litigation has been going on for years, and my understanding is that there is no court action scheduled that could have any effect on water deliveries in the coming years.

If the contracts are ultimately changed to protect California salmon fisheries, that would be many years down the line, and the Sacramento River contractors will have the opportunity to negotiate changes directly with the Interior Department in a public process. That is how it works.

So this amendment puts us in a strange position of trying to bar the Bureau of Reclamation from terminating water deliveries that nobody has asked them to terminate in anticipation of a court order that nobody is seeking. It is completely unnecessary.

□ 1700

Second, this amendment interferes in a court case in a way that should worry all of us in this body. The amendment claims to be about preserving the status quo on the Sacramento River. That is all fine, but if that is the concern that contracts might be terminated—even though nobody is asking them to be terminated and they don't expire for another 30 years—why come to Congress?

The Sacramento River contractors are represented by astute and capable lawyers who could easily go to the court and seek interim relief to do this, and yet they have not sought that relief. Instead, they have come here to the House floor asking to be treated differently than every other Central Valley Project contractor. Seeking a rider to circumvent a court case that is still in its very preliminary stages is no way to make public policy. In fact, I am not aware of Congress ever taking an extraordinary step like this.

There have been many Endangered Species Act challenges to water contracts over the years in California. Never has a court simply vacated any contracts. In fact, even after finding the contracts invalid under the Endangered Species Act, courts have always given the agencies and the contractors time to do their work and renegotiate the terms without terminating anything in the interim. That is exactly what will happen in this case if we simply let the litigation play out, as we should.

Madam Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Contra Costa County (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), who has been such a leader on California water for his 40 years in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for reserving this time in opposition.

I think the gentleman from California has made the point very clearly, this amendment is seeking to play by a set of rules that is different than any other contractor in the State, and also makes a point very clearly that there is no intent here by any of the parties to curtail these contracts in any immediate time or suggest that they be abandoned or they be found invalid, not at all. It is just a question of whether or not the basis on which they were determined to go forward, that biological opinion, has turned out not to be valid. So they are simply asking for a re-review of these contracts.

What this amendment would say is that this group of contractors gets to play by a different set of rules than everybody else in the State. As we all

know, those of us who are from California and many of our colleagues in Congress have learned over the years this is a very, very integrated system. It is a very complex system, and it has multiple claims on the water in the State, from farming, from technology, from communities, from manufacturing, from the chemistry, and from the environment, from recreational fishers, from commercial fishers, from an industry that is hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars and thousands of employees.

The question is are these contracts valid in light of the biological opinions. To say that they have been assumed in the biological opinions doesn't say that they have been reviewed. So this is just a question on this amendment to this legislation as to whether these people can take themselves outside of the judicial review, take themselves outside of the environmental considerations, take themselves outside of the economic considerations that no other water district, no other contractor gets to do.

Certainly at a time when people are under such stress about the availability of water, it starts to look like a very special privilege to be able to be plucked out when everybody else is undergoing this kind of scrutiny, trying to figure out how we can make the most flexible system, a system that can respond to this very diverse California economy and to the needs of domestic households in a very serious drought and a drought that may continue in the years to come. Again, nobody has suggested that we abrogate these contracts simply to proceed under regular order.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. KAPTUR. I continue to reserve a point of order.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chairman, I yield, upon the heels of the statements by my bay area colleagues, 2 minutes of time to my colleague from the valley, Mr. GARAMENDI, who represents much of this area.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of this question.

I think it would be wise to really take a look at the language of the amendment. It basically says that none of the funds made available by this act may be used by the Bureau to terminate, to implement, administer, or enforce the termination. This is about the Bureau terminating. It simply says the Bureau cannot terminate the contract until this court case is settled.

Is it necessary? It really depends what the Bureau intends to do. I would suspect that the Bureau probably would not move to terminate, but they could, in which case chaos ensues.

There will be a settlement in this court case at some time in the future. We don't know when. It is a very complex case. It deals with biological opinions. It deals with the ESA. It deals with very complex biological cir-

cumstances of the fish in the delta. This amendment simply says the Bureau cannot terminate until the court case has been settled. That is it.

Is it necessary? Well, it could be necessary. Therefore, this simply puts in place a requirement that would avoid chaos in the Central Valley Project. That is it.

My colleagues with whom I normally stand side by side in protecting the rivers, I find myself on the opposite side because this amendment needs to be understood in its simplicity and in its potential importance. Therefore, I support the amendment.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, what time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I appreciate my colleague additionally adding to that.

I think in response to the amendment not being needed or setting a bad precedent, the stability that is so desperately needed for water delivery to the whole project is why we are doing this. It will have effect for 1 year or until the case is settled. These are ongoing contracts. We are not changing anything. It is not moving in any new direction here. But the instability that can be caused by an impending ruling or maybe a change of mind by the Bureau of Reclamation would cause much chaos, as my friend had suggested. This isn't an unreasonable amendment to add to maintain the stability we need for an additional year.

I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states, in pertinent part, "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment imposes additional duties by requiring the Bureau to determine whether a decision constitutes a resolution.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I do.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I would like a ruling in opposition to that, because I think what we are talking about here does not change law. It changes nothing other than maintaining the direction we have. It is not requiring any action by the Bureau or Department of the Interior or any other government agency, nor prejudicing anything by the court, simply keeping what we have in place with the contracts and the stability that is needed.

So I think the point of order is invalid with what the intention of this amendment is.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination as to what constitutes the resolution of a particular court case through a decision.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. For an additional amount for programs, projects, and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation authorized under the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act (title XVI of Public Law 102-575; 43 U.S.C. 390h et seq.), there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Nuclear Energy" is hereby reduced by, \$52,000,000.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Chair, California and the rest of the West are facing a historic drought right now. Nearly 80 percent of California was under extreme drought conditions in June, and 36 percent of our State is in "exceptional" drought in that category, the highest category, in fact, on the U.S. Drought Monitor.

Emergency water conservation plans are being adopted across the State, including many mandatory measures. Cities and counties are dealing with uncertain water supplies, farmers and ranchers are facing incredibly difficult decisions, and tribes and those who depend on healthy fisheries for their livelihood are facing shortages like they have never seen.

Congress can't make it rain. What we can do is invest in drought-resistant water supplies through smart, sustainable investments in conservation and water reuse, and that is what this amendment is all about.

My amendment directs \$52 million to the Bureau of Reclamation for title XVI water conservation and reuse projects. Through this program, Reclamation works across the West to support municipalities, farmers, fish and wildlife, and recreation through water-saving conservation, reuse, and recycling infrastructure projects.

Although the Energy and Water bill before us today does fund the program, this drought is showing us that we have to do a lot more.

California's State water board is stepping up. They made an \$800 million investment in water reuse projects earlier this year, but we on the Federal

side should be able to add more to that. We should add \$52 million to combat this urgent problem in California and other Western States.

This amendment is offset through a reduction in the Department of Energy's nuclear energy account. We have tough choices to make. I think we all understand that. Responding, however, to this drought should be a national priority.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I strongly oppose this ill-conceived amendment.

This amendment would cut \$52 million out of the Nuclear Energy Program. This is on top of an amendment that was adopted yesterday that already cuts \$73 million out of the nuclear energy program.

What I have heard for 2 days now is that climate change is a big issue. In fact, the drought in California and the West has been blamed on climate change. It may be true. I don't know. But if you believe that, then why are you attacking the one thing that can produce energy for this country in a carbon-free way? That makes no sense.

So I strongly oppose this amendment. As I said, I understand my colleague's support for the title XVI program. Due to the request from the gentleman and many others within this Congress, funding for the title XVI program basically is at current rate while many other programs have been cut.

We did this by balancing many priorities that the amendment would completely ignore. The amendment would cut, as I said, \$52 million from nuclear energy. This is a 6 percent cut on top of the amendment yesterday. Accepting this amendment would be a 14 percent cut in nuclear energy.

Again, if you really believe in climate change and that we have to address it, one of the major things that is going to address it is going to be nuclear energy. Well, I like wind and solar and all of those kind of things. They don't produce the energy for the base load that is necessary in this country, particularly in California.

As I said, this is an ill-conceived amendment. Funding for nuclear research and development is a critical part of this recommendation support for a balanced energy portfolio, American manufacturing, and reduced reliance on foreign energy sources. Nuclear power currently generates 20 percent of the Nation's electricity, and it will continue to play a role in the future, I hope. Nuclear energy will be part of the energy mix in the future. America invented nuclear power, but now other nations are mimicking our companies' designs and building them entirely within their own borders.

This amendment is bad policy, and I strongly oppose its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Chair, we either believe that this critical drought in California and other Western States, the most extreme drought that many of us have seen in our lifetime, we either believe it is a national crisis and a national priority, or we don't.

A few months ago, House Republicans put forward a bill that represented itself as a response to this drought, and yet it offered no immediate relief to the folks who are suffering in California.

Instead, what it did is hack away at environmental laws and try to do some violence to 100 years of deference to State policy on water rights and otherwise pick winners and losers in ways that was not responsive to this drought.

What this amendment offers, though, is something that can make an immediate difference. The water that we save through conservation, the water that we can save in the years ahead through water recycling, is some of the firmest, most reliable, most cost-effective water that you can provide. It is one of the smartest investments you can make in a State like California.

We need it to respond to this drought, and we need it to make our water supplies more reliable and resilient for future droughts, which we know are coming with more severity and more frequency.

I will close by urging my colleagues to vote "yes" for this important amendment which does respond to the critical drought that is facing California and other Western States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the study of the Missouri River Projects authorized in section 108 of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2009 (division C of Public Law 111-8).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, just turn on the news and you will see reports that highlight the need for a strong and resilient flood protection system as people along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers are bracing for potential floodings.

These basins have faced major challenges over the past few years due to both extreme flooding and droughts. This devastation, combined with a sluggish economy and our aging inland waterways infrastructure, means that now, more than ever, we must be focused and responsible with taxpayer-funded river projects.

My amendment would prohibit funding for the Missouri River Authorized Purposes Study, also known as MRAPS. This \$25 million-earmarked study comes on the heels of a comprehensive \$35 million, 17-year study that showed that the current authorized purposes are important and should be maintained.

This Congress and this administration need to focus on protecting human life and property by maintaining the safety and soundness of our levees. We also must support the important commercial advantages provided to us by our inland waterways system.

The Missouri River moves goods to market and is an important tool in both domestic and international trade. That is why the American Waterways Operators, the Coalition to Protect the Missouri River, the Missouri Farm Bureau, and the Missouri Corn Growers support this amendment.

This study puts in jeopardy not only the lower Missouri River, but also the flow of the Mississippi River, which could create devastating consequences for navigation and transportation, resulting in barriers for waterways operators, agriculture, and every product that depends on the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers to get to market.

The current authorized uses of the Missouri River provide necessary resources and translate to continued economic stability not only for Missourians, but also for many Americans living throughout the Missouri and lower Mississippi River basins.

This study is duplicative and wasteful of taxpayer dollars. On this exact issue we have already spent 17 years and \$35 million on hundreds of public meetings and extensive litigation. I offered identical language during our first debate on the fiscal year 2011 continuing resolution. That amendment passed by a vote of 245–176. The exact amendment was also offered and passed by a voice vote in 2012 by a vote of 242–168 in 2013, and again by voice vote in last year's debate.

I appreciate my colleagues who offered their support and hope to have that support again.

Madam Chair, there is no doubt in my mind that water resources receive too little funding. It is time for the Federal Government to refocus and reprioritize to create safer, more efficient infrastructure for our inland waterways and stop spending hard-earned taxpayer dollars unnecessarily.

I ask my colleagues for support of this amendment and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, after line 20, insert the following: SEC. 508. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to approve a liquefied natural gas export application from a facility that would be supplied with or export liquefied natural gas on foreign-flag vessels when an application that would be supplied with or export liquefied natural gas on American-flag vessels is pending.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, I would hope my colleague from Idaho, after finishing the excellent explanation I have of this, would withdraw his point of order.

This is about an extraordinary opportunity that the United States has. We have been blessed with a very significant supply of natural gas. We have the technology to obtain that gas, and we also are now looking at the possibility or the reality of exporting that natural gas in the liquefied natural gas form. A facility is already licensed and is in the process of nearing construction on the Texas coast.

This amendment would actually replicate what was passed by the House of Representatives in 2006 and became law with President George W. Bush's signature, which basically said that if we are going to import natural gas, it must be imported on an American-flagged ship.

We will soon be exporting liquefied natural gas, and this is the only step available to me in this forum to replicate what we did in 2006. Now we would at least take a step towards making sure that natural gas is exported on American-flagged ships.

This is a big deal for the maritime industry of America. This is a big, big deal. Because if we fail to take steps along the way to secure the maritime industry, we will see it disappear.

We have the Jones Act, and that is good, but the Jones Act has only held the very minimum. It is 82 ships now. Forty years ago, we had 1,000 ships operating under the American flag, with American sailors and mariners.

If we allow this amendment to go into place, it would simply require that the Department of Energy put in front of other applications those applications that have utilized American-flagged ships in the export of their liquefied natural gas.

It sounds to me to be the right thing to do if you care about America. If you

don't give a hoot about American sailors and American ships and the American maritime industry, then brush this aside with the point of order.

Idaho isn't on the coast, but Idaho cares deeply, deeply about the export of American grain on American ships for programs such as Food for Peace and the Jones Act.

This amendment would begin to secure the American maritime industry by simply saying to the Department of Energy: If you are going to approve an LNG export facility, then put first in line that export facility that is going to utilize American sailors, American crews, and American ships. If you care about this Nation's maritime industry, then you ought to be supporting this amendment and my next one, which goes in the same direction.

So I would ask my colleague from Idaho, who controls this debate at this moment, to put aside his point of order and allow the House of Representatives to have a vote on whether they care—all 435 of us—about the American maritime industry and this one little step in providing an opportunity for American-made ships, American sailors, American crews, and the American maritime industry to survive in a very hostile environment, where other countries, like China, and others, subsidize their maritime industry and have literally decimated the American maritime industry.

Let's support Americans. Let's support our industry. Let's have this amendment come to a vote on the floor and let us all see whether we stand with the American Shipbuilding Council and the Navy League and others who do support this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I reserve my point of order and claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I don't usually do that, but since he challenged me directly, let me see if I have got this straight. We have a law that says if you are going to import natural gas, it has to be on an American-flagged ship. And now we want to put in a law that says if you export natural gas, it has to be on an American ship.

So, as I understand it, if every other country adopted a law similar to this, according to their country, we could neither import nor export natural gas around this world. So while this might be a good law, seemingly, I don't see how it would actually be beneficial.

The gentleman always has thoughtful amendments which always seem to be out of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XX1.

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Of course I do.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. GARAMENDI. My colleague from Idaho correctly asked me a question: How does this work? Would this in fact stop the export of LNG?

No, it absolutely would not. Other countries who want the LNG may or may not operate ships. The fact of the matter is it is going to take hundreds of ships to export this natural gas.

The reality is that this amendment—

The CHAIR. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I will take your admonition and continue on.

How much time do I have to talk on the point of order?

The CHAIR. This debate is not timed.

The gentleman must confine his remarks to the merit of the point of order.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Did the Chairwoman say that the time is unlimited as long as I speak to the subject?

The CHAIR. It is within the discretion of the Chair to entertain argument on a point of order.

The gentleman may be heard on the point of order only.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We will come back at this in the proper way.

The CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination of the flag status of vessels on pending export applications.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

□ 1730

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk. It is amendment No. 62.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to continue the study conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to section 5018(a)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Missouri and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Madam Chair, just last week, folks along the Missouri River were bracing for the river to possibly reach flood stage.

Should the basin have received a few more inches of runoff, homes, farms,

and businesses would have been inundated with devastating flood waters. While it appears the danger has subsided for now, these citizens are not in the clear and will have to remain prepared for the rest of the flood season. These recent events serve to highlight the importance of maintaining effective flood control infrastructure.

Though it is one of our region's greatest resources, the Missouri River would produce extreme, erosive regular flooding and be mostly unfit for navigation, if not for the aggressive long-term management by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Congress first authorized the Missouri River bank stabilization and navigation project, BSNP, in 1912, with the intention of mitigating flood risk and maintaining a navigable channel from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth in St. Louis.

Though the BSNP's construction was completed in the 1980s, the corps' ability to make adjustments as needed remains crucial to this day.

President Obama, in his fiscal year 2015 budget, requested \$56 million for the Missouri River Recovery Program, which primarily goes towards the funding of environmental restoration studies and projects.

This funding dwarfs the insufficient \$8.5 million that was requested for the entire operations and maintenance of the aforementioned BSNP. It is preposterous to think that environmental projects are more important than the protection of human life.

I do not take for granted the importance of river ecosystems. I grew up near the Missouri River, as did many of the people I represent, yet we have reached a point in our Nation at which we value the welfare of fish and birds more than the welfare of our fellow human beings. Our priorities are backwards, Madam Chair.

My amendment will eliminate the Missouri River Ecosystem Restoration Plan, or MRERP, a study that has become little more than a tool of the environmentalists for the promotion of returning the river to its most natural state, with little regard for flood control, navigation, trade, power generation, or the people who depend on the Missouri River for their livelihoods.

The end of the study will in no way jeopardize the corps' ability to meet the requirements of the Endangered Species Act. MRERP is one of no fewer than 70 environmental and ecological studies focused on the Missouri River.

The people who have had to foot the bill for these studies, many of which take years to complete and are ultimately inconclusive, are the very people who have lost their farms, their businesses, and their homes.

Our vote today will also show our constituents that this Congress is aware of the gross disparity between the funding for environmental projects and efforts and the funding for the protection of our citizens.

This exact amendment has been passed by voice vote during debate in

the last 3 fiscal year Appropriations bills, which were ultimately signed into law by President Obama. It is supported by the American Waterways Operators, the Coalition to Protect the Missouri River, the Missouri Farm Bureau, and the Missouri Corn Growers Association.

It is time for Congress to take a serious look at the water development funding priorities, and it is time to send a message to the Federal entities that manage our waterways. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and support our Nation's river communities and encourage more balance in Federal funding for water infrastructure and management.

Madam Chair, I ask my colleagues for their support of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, I have amendment No. 102 at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, after line 20, insert the following: SEC. 508. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to approve an application for the supply or export of liquefied natural gas unless the Department of Energy has consulted with the United States Maritime Administration on the availability of United States-flag vessels to transport the liquefied natural gas.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, it is *deja vu*. I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, before we go to the point of order dance, which we seem to be pretty good at, I want to explain why this is an important step. It is not as strong as the previous issue I raised, but it is, nonetheless, a very, very important step in the process of how we are going to export our liquefied natural gas.

As I said earlier, the United States is blessed with a very significant amount of natural gas. Many people raise the question about whether we should export it at all. That question is interesting, but moot because we are going to export it.

We have already had one facility that has been approved and will be soon exporting gas. The question that this amendment addresses is: Will that gas be exported on American ships, with American flags, with American sailors?

As I said with regard to the previous amendment that I brought up, this issue has already been resolved with regard to the importation of natural gas.

We are now talking about the exportation of natural gas, and therefore, we would simply do the same thing we do with import—do it on American ships, with American sailors, with the American flag.

There is a reason for that. I explained that earlier. It has to do with our maritime industry. It has to do with the safety of those ships. Let me just tell you that these ships carry an extraordinary amount of natural gas, and should there be an incident, then it could be extraordinarily dangerous in our ports. That is why the original law in 2006 was put in place.

All this amendment does is to set small criteria for what already happens. The Department of Energy does consult with MARAD. They already do the consultation.

This simply says: in that consultation, consider the American flagging of these ships. It doesn't set a requirement. It doesn't set new law. It simply says: when you consult, Mr. Secretary of Energy, with MARAD, then consider the American flagging of these ships. That is it—nothing more.

I have got to tell you that this is important stuff, and that is why the Navy League and that is why the Shipbuilders Council and, as I said, others—I don't have their letters with me today—have said in their letter—and I will read this paragraph—that one proposed amendment would require the Department of Energy, DOE, to consult with MARAD on the availability of U.S.-flagged vessels in processing applications for the export of liquefied natural gas, LNG.

That is it. They support this. Why? Because they see the opportunity for the maritime industry to do in the export what is required in the import. That is it. How this could be ruled out of order, I don't understand, but when that opportunity comes, I intend to take that up also.

Why don't we vote? As Members of this House, why don't we vote on whether we support our maritime industry or not?

I yield the remaining time to my colleague from the great State of Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I would just like to thank the gentleman for offering his amendment.

Even though it is subject to a point of order, I think you are drawing attention to the importance of the U.S. maritime industry, and this burgeoning opportunity is extraordinarily important. I just wanted to commend the gentleman for that, and I know how hard you fight for our ports and for our maritime community. Let's find a way to do this somehow.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 45 seconds remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I don't know what more to say here. The points of order are useful, I suppose, but not to me.

Madam Chair, to this issue, I would love to see a vote on the House floor on

whether we really support our maritime industry, on whether we really support our sailors or not.

This is about as minimal an amendment as I could imagine, and I am almost embarrassed in bringing something so weak before this floor on something so important as the future of our maritime industry.

I don't know that I have any choice, but to at least try with this small step to bring before the House an amendment that would really help our industries.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve my point of order, and I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, the gentleman brings up an interesting subject, as the gentlewoman from Ohio said, and it is something that I would hope he would continue to work on through the appropriate channels. There are problems that may exist with his proposal here, and this is not the right place to do it, on the appropriations bill.

The amendment would prevent the Department of Energy from approving an application for liquefied natural gas export, unless the Department has consulted with the U.S. Maritime Administration on the availability of U.S.-flagged vessels to transport the liquefied natural gas. The Department does not have nor are applicants for LNG export currently required to provide information on which vessels will be used for transportation.

In fact, shipping companies are separate and distinct from companies applying for export licenses, and assessing the shipping requirements for LNG is not within the DOE's current realm of technical expertise. The reality is that there are a few, if any, U.S.-flagged vessels capable of carrying LNG at this point.

I know the gentleman would like to change that, and I agree with him on that, but we need to do it through the proper channels. We need to do it through legislation that, I understand, the gentleman is probably working on now through the authorizing committees.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment imposes additional requirements.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I do, Madam Chair.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, keeping in mind your admonition that I speak to the point of order and not to the underlying amendment, I don't believe this changes any existing law; although, the entire bill changes existing law.

This amendment speaks to one part of what already takes place, and that is that the Department of Energy does consult with MARAD on this subject matter. This amendment simply says that the Department, in that consultation, shall consider the issue of availability of American-flagged crude-LNG tankers. It doesn't say you can't go forward. You can go forward. It doesn't say anything about that. It simply says that, in that consultation, take into account this simple issue.

With regard to the point of order, the amendment that preceded my attempt with this amendment did, in fact, change law, but it was not ruled out of order.

Now, I accept the fact that I can't have it my way. In fact, I am one of seven children, and I have never really had it my way. But this is not a substantive or even a minor change in law compared to what preceded this amendment.

Okay. I know I am going to lose this one, but I am not going to give up on this issue. I appreciate the support of the chair on building American LNG tankers, and we will bring that to the appropriate committee at the appropriate time.

In the meantime, Madam Chair, I think you are about to make a ruling.

□ 1745

The CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The Chair finds that this amendment imposes new duties on the Department of Energy to consult with the U.S. Maritime Administration.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STOCKMAN

Mr. STOCKMAN. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ENERGY LOAN PROGRAM.

No funds made available by this Act may be used for the Department of Energy's Loan Program Office.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Madam Chair, we have seen, as you get on the plane you fly into San Jose, Madam Chairman, as you fly and drive south, you will see a

huge building which was built with taxpayer money. This building is known as Solyndra, and the assets that were contained within were sold to the Chinese for 10 cents on a dollar. So our money, our taxpayer dollars, went to a program which failed.

Again and again, you see the Energy Department investing and calling winners and losers; and I, for one, want to see a stop to the money that flows from the taxpayers into failed, non-productive industries.

This amendment simply eliminates the funding for a program which has already been demonstrated as an embarrassment, not just to our government, but actually to the administration. I think that, quite frankly, it is a simple amendment, and it would do great justice to the American taxpayers and would do great justice to America if we stop funding the Chinese technology through “gimme” loan programs and selling our assets at 10 cents on a dollar.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Chairman, I rise strongly to oppose the amendment of my friend. The funds my colleague seeks to remove are administrative costs that the Department of Energy needs to conduct oversight of its existing loan portfolio.

The recent loan guarantee to create the first new nuclear facilities in over 30 years at the Vogtle plant in Georgia will create thousands of jobs and will need oversight to ensure funds are spent properly.

In April, the Department made available \$8 billion of loan guarantees to accelerate advanced fossil energy technologies on the cusp of development. These loan guarantees, among others, need administrative support for decades to come.

Without those administrative costs, the Department would not be able to monitor risk, manage projects, or provide the proper financial analysis that a loan guarantee needs. These activities are essential to ensure that taxpayer funds are protected in the existing loan portfolio.

For these reasons, Madam Chairman, I cannot support our colleague's amendment, and I urge Members to vote “no.”

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Madam Chair, I respect my colleague, and I think he has some valid points; however, we repeat this mistake over and over again when we invest in failed projects that continually end up costing the taxpayers money and then we end up selling it to a Third World or some other country, and our taxpayers are losing money.

I, for, one, would like to send a message to the Department telling them

we as taxpayers don't want to see them wasting money, and, hopefully, this will be a shot across the bow where they are more studious with our money and more aware of the taxpayers' concern that they should not invest in every kind of program.

In fact, the administration just again loaned more money to solar panels, which, again, is going to go bankrupt. In fact, almost all the solar panels which they have loaned money to have all gone bankrupt, and that ends up coming out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to our distinguished colleague from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman of the full committee for yielding and rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I find it extremely shortsighted because in this particular program we have so many successes. We have built 15 advanced vehicle manufacturing facilities, one of the largest wind farms in the world; constructed the first nuclear power plant in the country in more than 3 decades, the largest photovoltaic generation facility of its kind, the largest concentrated solar power plant in the world.

I can tell you this isn't just—this is new technology. This is like NASA at the beginning, where we have got private sector money involved but also public sector money.

There will be some errors made, that is true. And let me tell you, the Chinese undercut the market. I have seen it happen. I am from the solar valley of Ohio, and I saw what the Chinese did.

We still have First Solar, the best company in the country in terms of volume and so forth, and that was largely privately funded; but at the beginning it had some photovoltaic research dollars that came from the Department.

So we are talking about inventing the future. This isn't quite the same as going out for a car loan, because when you have predators like China come and literally buy your technology from under you in your startup company, it is a very slippery playing field.

I would say they have done a commendable job in embracing the future. I think the gentleman's amendment really is not constructive.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I oppose the amendment and ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STOCKMAN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STOCKMAN

Mr. STOCKMAN. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ OFFSHORE DRILLING PERMITS.

No funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Energy to block approval of offshore drilling permits.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Madam Chair, there is oversight. I would argue that there is oversight on the permits such as off the coast of Texas in which we have been developing it, and there has been, I feel, unfair interference. I think to send a signal to the Department that we are serious about allowing us to become number one in the world of energy, my district alone employs thousands and thousands of people in the energy industry, and having these kind of restrictions laid upon the industry is not long-sighted but, rather, short-sighted.

So I would ask that the amendment be accepted as proposed. I think that, overall, it will be a benefit to the United States if we develop.

Off the coast of California, they have as much as \$1 trillion in reserves, and much of it is actually seeping up naturally onto the shores of California. Actually, by allowing industry to develop those fields, you would actually have less seepage of oil up on the coast of California.

I, for one, want us to continue to create jobs, and the number one job creator in the United States now and today is energy. I think that if we look at the future, the future of the United States is going to be in the energy industry as we surpass Saudi Arabia.

Madam Chairman, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Number one, it is nongermane to our bill. In fact, the amendment is actually unnecessary because there are no funds related to this purpose in our bill at all. Perhaps the gentleman could present the amendment to another bill, but literally, it is extraneous. It has no relationship to the bill before us here in the House, and I would ask my colleagues to oppose it.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STOCKMAN. My colleague from Ohio, whom I have for many years admired, if that is accurate, then it

shouldn't be a problem supporting it if it doesn't have any impact on the bill. I believe it does. From what I understand, it would be germane, but that is a difference of opinion.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STOCKMAN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 508. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce any rule that would increase electricity prices or reduce electricity reliability.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chairman, I want to begin by congratulating my colleagues, Chairman SIMPSON and Ranking Member KAPTUR, for crafting a strong bipartisan bill that enhances our Nation's energy infrastructure, strengthens our nuclear weapon security programs, and ensures investments are made to grow jobs here in America.

Furthermore, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member and the hardworking committee staff for accepting language into the base bill regarding navigable waters. This past April, 28 of my colleagues joined me in a letter to the Appropriations Committee suggesting language be included. I am pleased that it ended up in the final product, and I thank you, Chairman SIMPSON, as do our Nation's farmers and ranchers.

The amendment I bring to the floor today would limit the administration's ability to create and enforce rules through the Department of Energy, rules that would increase our cost of electricity and decrease the reliability of our electric grid.

This administration has made unprecedented rules and regulations when it comes to the sources of our electric generation. This President's ideological stance against fossil fuels, which supplies 80 percent of our domestic

electricity, is crippling industry and increasing costs for all Americans.

These policies injure low-income Americans the most. Those with the least amount of disposable income in my north central Florida region and district will have to choose between feeding their families or possibly turning on their air conditioner.

This is America, and we have the means to produce inexpensive, reliable energy sources, and we need to do just that. We do it responsibly, and we have become great stewards of the environment.

□ 1815

We, as the people of government, in government, should do what is best for the American people, for the American economy, increasing our security, energy security, and our competitiveness.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) for any remarks that he may have.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I want to say, even though I am going to raise a point of order against this amendment, I support the idea of what he is trying to do.

I am concerned about some of the unintended consequences this amendment might have. But I agree with its intent, to prevent administration rules that increase electricity prices or reduce electricity reliability.

I look forward to working with my colleague to identify and mitigate, if necessary, its unintended consequences and the ways that we might be able to do this that don't subject themselves to a point of order.

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, I understand that, and I appreciate that the chairman's concern is the broad nature of the amendment.

Still, my hope is to work with Chairman SIMPSON and Chairman UPTON to find a solution to this problem. I cannot and shall not sit idly while this administration singlehandedly destroys the most reliable and affordable energy source in the world.

And with that, Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairwoman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment requires a new determination.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination as to the effect of a rule on electricity prices or reliability.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the order entitled "Order Accepting Proposed Tariff Revisions and Establishing a Technical Conference" issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on August 13, 2013 (Docket No. ER13-1380-000).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from New York and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Madam Chair, many of my colleagues may be familiar with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, also known as FERC. But I imagine few of my colleagues have experienced an agency with the accountability that we have experienced in the Hudson Valley recently, or have seen how a few unelected bureaucrats can wreak havoc, literally, on our utility bills and those of our struggling neighbors without regard for basic facts, like how those people use energy or how those bills will be paid or whether people can even afford to pay these bills after the worst winter and the highest energy costs we have seen in a generation. This egregious bureaucratic overreach has to stop.

In January, FERC approved a plan to create what is called a new capacity zone in the Hudson Valley. Now, this new zone would arbitrarily impose an unprecedented \$230 million increase in energy costs in my region for just the first year alone, and nearly \$500 million in increased costs over the first 3 years. This is absolutely outrageous and unnecessary.

No one elected anyone in the FERC, and they are accountable to no one. But their decisions affect all of us and, in this case, affect the struggling ratepayers of the Hudson Valley.

Initial estimates suggest that customers throughout the Hudson Valley could see their utility bills go up by as much as 10 percent. This, again, after the worst winter and highest energy costs in a generation.

Every single day, I am hearing from my neighbors about how awful this decision is and their fears of how they will pay for their energy. I heard from Russ in Putnam Valley, who told me that, as a senior on a fixed income, this is an increase that he simply can't afford. He is expected to pay \$120 more over the next year, and he doesn't have it.

And it is not just families that will be hit. Schools, like those in Carmel,

are scrambling to find ways to cut budgets that are already stretched thin. And our large employers, like IBM, estimate that this FERC decision could cost just IBM up to \$10 million over the next year.

Now, you might think that any agency with that kind of destructive power might be accountable to someone, but apparently you would be wrong.

Last week, I received a letter from Dutchess County Executive Marcus Molinaro stating that, in the 20 years that he has been in elected office, “I have never interacted with a less accessible, less accountable government entity, seemingly impervious to legislative and public scrutiny.” I couldn’t agree more, and we have that agreement across party lines and across levels of government.

The new capacity zone is an unnecessary and destructive step designed to fix a problem that we can fix in so many other ways, and we have to rein in these unaccountable Washington bureaucrats.

So my amendment is simple. It would specifically prohibit funds from going towards allowing the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to enforce the decision that created the new capacity zone. Because a runaway agency like this needs a serious wake-up call, and this amendment will let FERC know that they are accountable to folks like Russ and the people in Carmel and the seniors in my district and to this Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment. And I certainly understand the gentleman’s concerns.

We engaged in a colloquy an hour or so ago. And I supported the Member’s concerns, and I still do. However, this amendment goes beyond what I can support.

I am concerned that such a blunt action, as this amendment, may have unintended consequences. We simply have not had time to understand all of the implications to electricity prices and electricity reliability or other interactions with the FERC order referenced in the amendment. Therefore, I must oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for his assistance with the colloquy earlier. I respect his remarks.

Let me just point out that this amendment relates to a specific FERC docket. So by definition, it can affect nothing other than this specific decision that I have referred to.

I yield for such time as he may wish to consume to the gentleman from New York, CHRIS GIBSON, my colleague from across the aisle who also represents the Hudson Valley.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my friend SEAN PATRICK MALO-

NEY. We are working together on this amendment, and we are fighting for our constituents.

We just came through last winter, one of the harshest winters for those in upstate New York, where we saw our gas and home heating prices rise. We saw our electricity prices double. And yet as my friend Mr. MALONEY just pointed out, we see that FERC wants to continue on and has moved forward with this new capacity zone, which they claim is going to lead to more generation.

But, look, these rising rates, they are not necessary. We already have interest in our region for more generation, and this is just more burden on our constituents.

And if you take a look at how this is impacting across the area, this is hurting hardworking families. It is impacting small businesses. So we are talking about a loss of jobs, we are talking about heartache on families, all for something that is unnecessary. And, as Mr. MALONEY pointed out, this is coming from FERC, which has really been unaccountable when it comes to our concerns.

Mr. MALONEY and I, our Governor, one of our Senators—we have had leaders at every echelon reach out to FERC and explain to them, especially given the harsh winter that we went through and the fact that it is unnecessary. This is tone-deaf and outrageous that they are going forward. We want to fight this.

We thank the chairman and ranking member for their acknowledgement in the report language. Going forward, we think that will be helpful. But we need relief right now.

We are asking for support for this amendment. We think this is the right thing to do. And I would ask all my colleagues to stand up. Let’s fight for families. Let’s fight for small business.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used within the borders of the State of Louisiana by the Mississippi Valley Division or the Southwestern Division of the Army Corps of Engineers or any district of the Corps within such divisions to implement or enforce the mitigation methodology, referred to as the “Modified Charleston Method”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to present an amendment that is a bipartisan amendment that has passed for the last 2 years that this bill has come before the House.

What this deals with is a change in process for mitigation methods that the Corps of Engineers implemented back in 2011 called the Modified Charleston Method. And when they implemented this new method of mitigation, it basically started making a lot of projects—surely in southeast Louisiana—unworkable, including, Mr. Chairman, flood protection projects.

One of the things we have seen is that it actually has increased the cost of flood protection projects along the coast by over 300 percent, which in many cases has made those flood protection projects unaffordable for local governments to be able to afford for themselves, where they are putting up their own money. It is not even Federal money.

And here comes the Federal Government, putting in an unworkable plan that makes it cost-prohibitive to actually implement flood protection. And, of course, we have seen at the Federal level what happens if you don’t have that kind of protection. We sure don’t want to be in a position where we are stopping local communities from being able to protect themselves against flood with their own money.

What is even more ironic about this, Mr. Chairman, is that the Corps of Engineers, while they have imposed this on local governments and private business, they have exempted themselves from it. The Corps of Engineers doesn’t even use this method that they have imposed on everybody else—I am sure because they recognize it would be unworkable for them. But they impose it on everybody else. That is not the way we should do business, Mr. Chairman.

What this amendment says is that no funds can be expended to implement that unworkable method. Let’s get back to the normal way of doing mitigation, which was practical, which was the way most other places in the country do it.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter from my colleague from Louisiana, CEDRIC RICHMOND, who is also in strong support and is the lead cosponsor of this amendment.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, July 10, 2014.

Hon. MIKE SIMPSON, Chairman,
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies House Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SIMPSON: I would like to express my support for this amendment being offered by my colleague from Louisiana, Mr. Scalise to H.R. 4923, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. This amendment deals with the use of the Modified Charleston Method by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers New Orleans district. This method is different from the method used for other areas across the country and has caused unique and significant problems for our area.

By increasing the cost of mitigation for a wide variety of important projects, the MCM has made some projects in our region dramatically, and in some cases even prohibitively, more expensive. These increasing costs for critical infrastructure and flood protection projects are deeply concerning, especially given the important flood protection projects currently being planned for in my district. Projects like the levee project for the West Shore of Lake Pontchartrain which would protect the homes of thousands of residents as well as businesses and energy infrastructure that is critical to the entire nation. We must ensure that the people of the River Parishes get the protection they need as quickly as possible. The escalating costs brought about by the MCM are concerning because of the effect it could have on projects like this.

This amendment says that we need to move forward with a better way to handle mitigation. We understand the need and the importance of proper mitigation for all projects. We just need to make sure that the method we use does not keep us from protecting our citizens or hamper our future economic development.

Sincerely,

CEDRIC L. RICHMOND.

Mr. SCALISE. I urge adoption, Mr. Chairman, and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for "DE-FOA0000697: Sustainable Cities: Urban Energy Planning for Smart Growth in China and India".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, at a time of deep deficits and a mounting national debt, we cannot allow our taxpayers' dollars to be squandered away in order to upgrade cities in China and India.

In 2012, a program was issued by the Department of Energy with the purpose of "conducting international collaborative efforts that accelerate the development and deployment of clean energy technologies" at the expense of the American taxpayer.

While this appropriation bill does not explicitly include funding for these projects, I believe this amendment is essential to ensure the administration cannot misuse hard-earned taxpayer money.

All in this Chamber have seen what the President is capable of, given the opportunity to invoke his ideological agenda. It is not America's job to help foreign nations upgrade their cities.

Countries like China and India have their own taxpayers and are among the largest economic engines in the world.

Our country was founded on the principle of self-determination. Enticing economic change in foreign countries with money borrowed from future generations is a gross departure of that principle, especially in these hard economic times.

And with that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), my colleague and good friend.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida yielding.

And really, I think this just goes back to a simple reflection of priorities. We are here tonight, and both sides are coming to the floor. They are offering amendments. They are talking about energy and water. And Chairman SIMPSON has done a fine job of bringing this to the floor, and I think we have some good stuff going here.

But this is about priorities. Why should we be looking at funding priorities for other countries who have their own sufficient taxpayer money, their own sufficient growth?

□ 1815

They may have trouble in growth, but why are we looking at it from a perspective that we should possibly say we are going to use our funds to do this on? This is not something we need to be a part of. It is not saying: just let China and India take care of themselves, we don't have a part.

We have plenty of private industry that will go in at a fee and also do this. Why would we be putting government funds possibly towards this.

I think this is another area where we deal with sustainable cities. This is a concern of many of my constituents. Some have actually called this looking at how we go across the world an agenda 21 wannabe. This is just simply something we shouldn't be doing.

This is just something that we want to limit and simply say: we are going to be a leader, let's let the rest of the world lead, but let's let them pay with their own dollars.

I appreciate the gentleman from Florida bringing this.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, we, again, as people in government that represent our constituents, we should do everything in our power to make America stronger, more economically sound, and more competitive across the world, not less.

Again, this amendment will prevent future actions from the administration causing hardworking American taxpayers' money to be spent to subsidize clean energy in countries like China and India.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman and Members, this amendment would prohibit funding for what is called the sustainable cities program, which is aimed at deploying U.S. technical expertise to urban energy planning for cities in places like India and China. So the gentleman and I look at this in a little bit of a different way.

Mr. Chairman, this effort is aimed at developing markets for U.S. products in places that are growing, and I think census figures show that India and China are absolutely growing, and their economies are growing.

In fact, in places like China, it is growing so fast that they are actually often stealing our technology and buying our companies out from underneath us, and we lose market edge.

Mr. Chairman, this particular program encompasses a variety of technical assistance activities to actually prime those markets for our clean technologies in places where there is population increase and a need for product and would help potentially to support the export of American clean energy technologies. That means jobs here at home; it means exports out of the United States, rather than imports in here in two major economies.

Working closely with U.S. companies, the Department of Commerce and other governments will focus on product testing and developing minimum standards, certifying that we can actually achieve the installation of these clean energy products. Here at home, obviously, we help our clean energy sector to develop.

Specific examples already underway include facilitating a memorandum of understanding that could lead to the first commercial-scale deployment of concentrated solar power deployment in China—a deal that could be valued at \$350 million—with manufacturing of the key intellectual property here in the United States.

Another involves gaining access to the wind energy market in China—which is a growing market—coordination and exchanges between our department and private sector, our U.S. and Chinese cities, has led to increasing sales of U.S. clean energy goods in China already.

It is no secret that China has some challenges—and India has challenges—dealing with the enormity of their populations and the stress on their energy infrastructure.

We need to boost innovation here at home. This is one very modest program, but one, I think, that deserves attention. The last time I looked, we, as a country, had a gigantic trade deficit with China. That means more goods coming in here than our goods going out.

Mr. Chairman, this is one small step forward to try to penetrate those markets using some of the higher tech technologies that we have in the energy field, so I oppose the gentleman's amendment. I think he might look at the program in a different way than I do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose it, as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 113-486.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee to carry out section 301 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 16421a; added by section 402 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-5)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to, again, offer an amendment that would stop a loan program created by the 2009 stimulus bill.

Last year's amendment passed the House by a significant margin, and the administration appeared to get the message, not authorizing any new projects during the fiscal year.

However, in their most recent budget request, they plan to receive and review 100 project proposals, review six business plan proposals, provide technical assistance for the development of four projects, and assist with two projects in the financing phase.

One of the future projects is estimated to cost \$1.5 billion for the Federal share alone, which is almost half of the Western Area Power Administration's borrowing authority.

How bad is this program? It is not merely a loan guarantee program, like the one that backed Solyndra. It is an actual loan from the Federal Government, with a built-in bailout mechanism. That's right, built in to the law is this actual bailout.

I am going to quote from what the law says:

If, at the end of the useful life of a project, there is a remaining balance owed to the Treasury under this section, the balance shall be forgiven.

That means we have got agenda-driven, uneconomical renewable energy projects being funded directly by the Federal Government, and if they fail, taxpayers are on the hook once again.

What has been the performance of these projects so far? In November 2011, the Department of Energy inspector general issued a lengthy management alert on the stimulus borrowing authority. To quote from that report:

Because of a variety of problems, the project is estimated to be 2 years behind schedule and \$70 million over budget; essentially out of funds; and currently at a standstill, with no progress being made. Western had not completed a formal root-cause analysis and corrective action plan designed to ensure more effective program safeguards are in place going forward. Because Western has committed \$25 million in developmental funding to a potential \$3 billion project that could ultimately require an investment of \$1.5 billion in Recovery Act borrowing authority, we are issuing this report as a management alert.

That is why last year's Republican budget noted:

The \$3.25 billion borrowing authority in the Western Area Power Administration's Transmission Infrastructure Program provides loans to develop new transmission systems aimed solely at integrating renewable energy. This authority was inserted into the stimulus bill without the opportunity for debate. Of most concern, the authority includes a bailout provision that would require American taxpayers to pay outstanding balances on projects that private developers failed to repay.

As I and many others have pointed out when the bill was passed, the stimulus—which was billed as funding shovel-ready programs—actually became a vehicle to bake in higher levels of spending and new government programs.

As with other government loan programs, we have all too often seen abuses and mismanagement, and this program is no exception.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank my colleagues, Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Chairman HASTINGS, for their past work in offering and marking up a bill to repeal this program. I urge my colleagues, again, to support and pass this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I think the gentleman's amendment, including some vagueness of his language, will likely have many unintended consequences. For example, one of the projects, the Enbridge corporation, which constructed the Montana-Alberta power line, has already repaid our government \$161 million of its borrowed authority—its loan—decades ahead of schedule, showing that transmission projects, when vetted properly, are sound investments.

Essentially, his proposal would repeal the Western Area Power Administration's borrowing authority for the construction of transmission lines that would bring renewable energy to market.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act provided \$3.25 billion in borrowing authority for WAPA. This authority allowed for the construction of new transmission lines to deliver power from renewable energy sources.

By repealing their authority, it is just another example of, unfortunately,

the Republican Party's anti-renewable energy strategy.

The borrowing authority has already led to the financing of two much-needed transmission lines out West—not even in my own part of the country—the one that I mentioned, the Montana-Alberta transmission line, which brings wind power to markets in our country, and the Palo Verde Electrical District 5 in Arizona. The Tohono O'odham Nation is already looking to utilize the PV-ED5 line to bring solar power generated on to their reservation.

Mr. Chairman, if adopted, the amendment would have the following impacts: for the Palo Verde project, which is customer driven, it is 92 percent complete, and it could be brought to a halt.

It supports mostly rural customers and Native American tribes and is a model of public-private partnership for which this program was created.

It will also allow those customers—and potentially others—to add renewable energy to the grid, while strengthening the transmission system in an area which is seeking growth and actually has more demand.

If that project is totally completed, something that is jeopardized by this amendment, the benefits of the project include providing customer access to the Palo Verde trading hub and also providing 300 megawatts of unconstrained transfer capability from ED5 to Palo Verde, to support and enhance the viability of renewable resources in development in southern Arizona.

Jobs and transmission investment capability would be negatively impacted, and it could impact how—on behalf of the ED5 project—how it reimburses staff for work in support of the project.

Now, I mentioned that there are projects already underway that this amendment would bring to a halt. What sense does that make? I mean, we have already got issues in our country.

We need jobs in this country. We need affordable energy in this country. We need diversified energy in this country. I really don't understand why the gentleman is offering this amendment, but I can tell you the attorneys who looked at this language continue to find there will be additional impacts due to the vagueness of the language you have proposed.

I would guess your amendment will likely have many other unintended consequences, such as impacts on the preference power customers.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, my response, Mr. Chairman, is, first of all, there is nothing vague about the billions and billions of dollars that have already

been wasted through corporate welfare, giving loans that are guaranteed by the Federal Government, loans to companies such as Solyndra and a whole list of others that now have failed and taken the taxpayer money with them.

Now, with regard to the gentleman's claim that programs and projects already in progress would be stopped, well, that is absolute nonsense because those deals have been signed. That money has already been committed.

What we are talking about is stopping any new projects. Again, I would emphasize here that, if these projects made sense—whether it is renewable or nonrenewable, whether it is carbon-based or noncarbon-based, there is plenty of capital out there to lend. There are a lot of people who want to make money on energy. There are a lot of people who have made money on energy.

The reason why there isn't a private market out there primarily is because the government has displaced that private market; and number two, in many cases, when the question is asked—in fact, the President of the United States—why is the government lending this money?

His answer was: well, because you can't get it from the private market and private investors. Why? Because it is a dumb idea. They will never get their money back.

So why in the world do we want to let the taxpayer money go down the tubes when other people, who are a heck of a lot smarter than we are, see that it is unfit for lending and for capital production?

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1830

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 801 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17281).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chair for the good work done on this piece of legislation, but I offer an amendment that would prohibit the use of funds to carry out a national media campaign to promote alternative green technologies.

In 2007, Congress authorized the Department of Energy to create a na-

tional media campaign to convince Americans to buy green technologies at the tune of \$5 million a year. Now, my amendment would simply prohibit funds from going to this misguided, unnecessary, government-run campaign.

As constituents in my Michigan district are struggling to deal with \$4 a gallon gas prices and energy costs brought about by this administration's harmful energy limitation policies, the last thing we need, Mr. Chairman, is Washington bureaucrats telling them how to live their lives.

They are smart enough to know, as are the overwhelming majority of American citizens in all of our districts, Mr. Chairman, to know what energy sources work for them, work best for their families, for their businesses, and especially when our country has emerged and is emerging still further—if we would allow it and encourage it as an energy superpower—and now leads the world in natural gas and oil production.

Instead of funding unnecessary ad campaigns, let's get to work on energy policy which takes advantage of our energy abundance and leads to lower prices, more jobs and greater global security.

Green technologies should be a part of a real all-of-the-above energy policy, but picking winners and losers is not the role of the Federal Government, nor is it in the core mission of the Department of Energy.

I was pleased that this amendment was adopted when I offered it last year, and I encourage my colleagues to once again support it.

Mr. Chairman, having said what I think is necessary, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 508. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to design, implement, administer, or carry out the United States Global Climate Research Program National Climate Assessment, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fifth Assessment Report, the United Nation's Agenda 21 sustainable development plan, the May 2013 Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866, or the July 2014 Sustainable Development Solutions Network and Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations' pathways to deep decarbonization report.

Mr. MCKINLEY (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from West Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to ones that have been offered in previous appropriations bills, and all have passed with strong bipartisan support.

This amendment would prohibit agencies like the Department of Energy and the Corps of Engineers from being required to spend money on climate change policies forced upon them by the Obama administration and which have been based on biased studies.

In a time of fiscal austerity and prioritization of spending, how can we justify taking money away from our country's leading scientists, physicists, and engineers at the National Energy Technology Lab, but at the same time ask them to research and develop clean coal technologies, carbon capture and sequestration, increased efficiencies for our turbines and power plants, and improving our natural gas extraction techniques from shale?

We should not be reducing funds for rejuvenating our locks and dams along America's rivers, especially when the American Society for Civil Engineers have rated our Nation's waterway infrastructure and land infrastructure a D-plus. Mr. Chairman, a D may be a passing grade for our President, but it is a failing mark in my book.

Spending precious resources to pursue a dubious climate change agenda compromises our clean energy research and America's infrastructure. When similar amendments were adopted previously, some claimed we were denying agencies the use of science.

That is simply not true, Mr. Chairman. We want them to use science, but, Mr. Chairman, I want them to use science that doesn't come with a biased agenda.

For example, the United Nations report says that the Antarctic ice is shrinking; however, NSA's satellites have confirmed that Antarctic ice levels have increased—increased by the size of Greenland, an alltime record.

Congress should not be spending money pursuing ideologically-driven experiments when we face real, serious challenges to our country's infrastructure and its pursuit for energy efficiency. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. It flies in the face of 97 percent of the world's scientists who agree that climate-warming trends over the past century are very likely due to human activities and could impose significant

human and economic costs on societies, including ours.

This amendment requires the Department of Energy to assume that carbon pollution isn't harmful and that climate change won't cost a thing. That is nothing but fantasy.

The Republicans, in general, don't seem to trust the scientists, and I would hope that they would listen to the economists and business leaders ringing alarm bells about the potential costs of unmitigated climate change.

Standard & Poor's rating services recently released a report warning that climate change will put downward pressure on the sovereign credit ratings of countries around the world. They wrote:

Climate change is likely to be one of the global megatrends impacting sovereign creditworthiness, in most cases, negatively.

For example, Standard & Poor's concludes that:

Extreme weather events, especially floods, can be expected to increasingly take a toll on a country's infrastructure and, thus, productivity.

Standard & Poor's also warned that fiscal performance will decline as government budgets come under increased stress from climate-induced emergency support and infrastructure reconstruction costs. We have had a little bit of that in our country already.

Last month, three former Secretaries of Treasury released a report on the economic costs of inaction on climate change. Henry M. Paulson, Treasury Secretary under President George Bush said:

Our economy is vulnerable to an overwhelming number of risks from climate change.

The report identifies numerous economic risks, including large-scale losses of coastal property and infrastructure, extreme heat across the Nation that threatens labor productivity, human health and energy systems, and shifting agricultural patterns and crop yields.

Secretary Paulson wrote that:

These risks include the potential for significant Federal budget liabilities, since many businesses and property owners turn to the Federal Government as the insurer of last resort.

The economic impacts of climate change will be felt globally, particularly by the poorest countries. Last year, the World Economic Forum released its annual global risks report, which was based on a survey of 1,000 experts from industry, government, academia, and nonprofits around the world on the global risks most likely to manifest over the next 10 years and those that could have the greatest impacts.

The report found that rising greenhouse gas emissions posed one of the biggest global risks in the coming decade and that failure to adapt to climate change could have a tremendous socioeconomic impact across the globe.

This is not just a looming threat. We are suffering, in our country, the cost

of climate change today—the skyrocketing costs of fighting wildfires, for example; the mounting costs to farmers of losing their crops and their livestock to more frequent and severe droughts; the enormous costs of rebuilding infrastructure swept away by more intense storms or threatened by steadily rising seas. Ask the people in Louisiana or New Jersey or New York.

This amendment ignores everything that is already happening and all of the warnings that it is going to get a lot worse. This amendment denies economic reality and decrees that climate change imposes no costs at all. Of course, ignoring the costs won't make them go away.

In fact, all evidence shows that the longer we wait, the more we will allow the risks to compound and accumulate, the more costly it will be to solve the problem in the end. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 508. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transform the National Energy Technology Laboratory into a government-owned, contractor-operated laboratory, or to consolidate or close the National Energy Technology Laboratory.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from West Virginia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, because there has been efforts, I suppose, to privatize and consolidate the National Energy Technology Laboratory, also known as NETL, this amendment is offered to eliminate that uncertainty and to continue the present public-private partnership.

NETL is our Nation's premier energy laboratory for fossil energy, using 600 government scientists, technicians, and employees, but they couple that with nearly 1,200 private sector contractors.

Through this partnership, NETL has developed breakthrough research, carbon capture, enhanced natural gas exploration and production, emission control for our power plants, and steam and gas turbine efficiency.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is that no other national laboratory has the expertise and the capabilities in fossil fuel energy to develop what NETL already has.

This public-private model has also been used by the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control.

Mr. Chairman, if our government research laboratories were privatized, what assurance would Members of Congress have that that research would be done in America?

Just pick up a newspaper on any day and you will read about another corporation moving its research and development work offshore. People looking to privatize and consolidate these laboratories seem to be searching for a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEBER OF TEXAS

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 508. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Cape Wind Energy Project on the Outer Continental Shelf off Massachusetts, Nantucket Sound.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a very simple and fiscally responsible amendment that should be supported by all Members of this body to prevent the DOE from moving forward on a loan guarantee to an offshore wind project. Let me hasten to add that Texas is the leading State for producing wind energy in this great country.

You know, Mr. Chairman, earlier this month, the Department of Energy approved a \$150 million conditional loan guarantee for the Cape Wind offshore wind energy project.

This project consists of 130 wind turbines, each 440 feet in height, spanning an area the size of Manhattan, and it is located in the Nantucket Sound off the coast of Massachusetts.

□ 1845

This project would be funded and built primarily by foreign businesses and would fail to create significant local employment opportunities. Rather than using local businesses in the State of Massachusetts, or even in the United States, Cape Wind has outsourced the building of turbines to Denmark and the production of turbine foundations to Germany.

It doesn't take more than a simple Google search, Mr. Chairman, to find out that this offshore wind project has been mired in controversy and litigation for the past 13 years.

Federal agencies were recently required by the courts to conduct more scientific reviews to better assess Cape Wind's impacts to the environment. Cape Wind's litigation troubles are far from over as project opponents—which include the Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound, Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility, the Town of Barnstable, and the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head—can appeal the project after the court rules on the agencies' response.

In addition, there remains an outstanding appeal of the Cape Wind project brought by the Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound and the Town of Barnstable against Massachusetts' regulators, the utility NSTAR, and Cape Wind. According to the Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound's president and CEO:

Our case that alleges NSTAR was coerced into signing a no-bid contract that violates Federal law, discriminates against affordable green power producers from out of State, and burdens small businesses and municipalities with unnecessarily high electricity costs.

Mr. Chairman, this loan guarantee is a wasteful gesture by DOE to support a project that falls into the same category as Solyndra, the "solar energy giant" that received over \$500 million in taxpayer money before its spectacular crash and burn 3 years ago. We cannot afford to have another failure like this occur paid for by our constituents.

Mr. Chairman, by supporting this amendment, the House can send an important message to this administration that every penny of taxpayer money is precious. If Cape Wind has merit, then it should be built on those merits from solely private dollars and not on the backs of American taxpayers.

I urge adoption of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MRS.
BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the recognition of my

amendment, and it is only a two-line amendment.

Before I get into the specifics on that amendment, I do want to thank Mr. DENT, the subcommittee chair, and Chairman ROGERS for the work they did on another issue on this bill which deals with the Department of Energy rules finalizing for "Standards for Ceiling Fans and Ceiling Fan Light Kits" and prohibiting money from being used on that regulation because of the impact that it would have on our constituents and on the price of ceiling fans. I appreciate the good work that they have done on that issue. I also appreciate the great work that they have done on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have got a \$34 billion bill in front of us. I so appreciate the work of the appropriators as they have approached this and the responsible manner that they have gone about in bringing this bill forward. It is a bill that is going to spend \$50.5 million less than in 2014. That is a good thing. The appropriators are to be commended for that. In addition, it is \$326.9 million less than what the President wanted. All of those are the facts and figures.

Tonight, this two-line amendment that I have says this is great work, but we have got problems. When you look at the economic situation in this country, when you look at what is happening with our debt, as we are pushing toward that \$18 trillion in debt, you have to say: How is it fair for us to keep borrowing money, borrowing money and spending it on Federal programs that are going to be left for our children and grandchildren to pay for? These are programs that many of them will never use. They are programs that will have outlived their usefulness by the time my two grandsons earn their first paycheck. By borrowing and not continuing to cut a little bit more and a little bit more, what we are doing is passing the bill to them. It is passing the buck onto future generations to pay for it.

My amendment is another 1 percent across-the-board cut. It would be another \$341 million in savings. What it says, very simply, to all of our agencies that are involved in this bill, everybody, a penny on the dollar; just reduce your spending by one penny on a dollar. Get in here, challenge yourselves, challenge your employees to save a cent, one penny, out of what they have been appropriated. Do it responsibly. And do it not only for the sovereignty of this Nation; do it for our children and our grandchildren. Don't burden them with debt.

What is happening with all this Nation's debt is the ultimate cap-and-trade. What we are doing is capping our children's future and trading it, trading it.

While there has been tremendous work done and our Republican-led Appropriations Committee is doing work which never has been done and reducing this spending and pulling it back,

we need to challenge these agencies to join us in this effort. Just as our businesses in each of our districts are cutting back and saving money, the Federal Government needs to be doing the very same thing.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

While I commend my colleague for her consistent work to protect taxpayer dollars, this is not an approach I can support. What she suggests of just saving one penny from the Federal agencies is what we have been doing for the last 4 years on the Appropriations Committee, as she recognized. We have been reducing spending. In fact, we have reduced spending much more than 1 percent.

This bill is fully consistent with the Ryan-Murray budget compromise, and it spends, as was mentioned, \$50 million below last year's level. The Ryan-Murray budget deal was passed by this House.

While difficult tradeoffs had to be made, this bill in its current form balances our needs. We prioritize funding for critical infrastructure and our national defense. These tradeoffs were carefully weighed for their respective impacts and are responsible, yet the gentlewoman's amendment proposes an across-the-board cut on every one of these programs. It makes no distinction between where we need spending to invest in our infrastructure, promote jobs, meet our national security needs, and where we need to limit spending to meet our deficit reduction goals.

The basic problem I have and have always had with across-the-board cuts is that it doesn't recognize the programs that are priorities and things that we ought to be spending money on, the Federal Government ought to be spending money on, and those things that maybe we ought to cut more.

In the Appropriations Committee, every time we do an appropriation bill, those are the decisions we make. We prioritize them. When the Democrats are in the majority, the priorities go toward their priorities; the spending goes toward their priorities more. When we are in the majority, the spending goes more toward our priorities.

If you look at our bill, there are areas in there that, if I were king for a day and could write any bill I wanted, there are areas I would probably cut more; there are areas that I would probably spend more. But this is a bill that is a compromise, hopefully a compromise for 435 Members of Congress that have different priorities and different needs. It does meet the budget goals that we have established in the Republican budget that was passed this year.

With that, I oppose this amendment, and I yield to my good friend from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and would merely echo his comments and say that Mrs. BLACKBURN's amendment is well-intentioned.

I think we have already met the goal in our subcommittee. We are \$50 million—million—below last year. It is important to keep your eye on the context. The context is, in the last 10 years—well, a little more than that. Since 2003, our country has spent \$2.3 trillion on paying for imported petroleum—\$2.3 trillion.

When you look at the budget deficit, ask yourself why this country has lost economic muscle inside our borders. Our meager \$34 billion tries to compensate for that \$2.3 trillion of loss. With oil at \$100 a barrel now, we could lose, probably in the next 20 years, close to \$10 trillion of economic activity related to the import of very expensive petroleum.

So what we try to do is to fund critical projects in this bill to help us crawl our way back to energy independence in this country, all the while cutting all our accounts. I think you can't cut the future off. You have to recognize the context in which you are operating.

So I think you are well-intentioned, but I think you are misfocused and I think you are missing the bigger—excuse the analogy—elephant in the room here, which is that we are losing wealth and losing strength economically because of these incredible imports that have just catapulted over the years.

In 1998, we began importing over half of what we consumed in petroleum. It is simply unsustainable. We have to reinvent our way forward in order to grow this economy at home and create the kind of robust middle class jobs and middle class incomes that the American people are asking us for.

I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

I oppose the amendment, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate their arguments. I am not going to argue with much of what they had to say. Indeed, the committee has met its goal. But to say this is not the context, I would beg to differ with the gentlewoman from Ohio.

If we wanted to spur energy production in this country, the President could go out here and do a one-stop shop. He could lift the ban on leases. He could open up U.S. production and exploration. Yes, there is a way to do that, and we would love to see him do that rather than restricting energy production.

When it comes to across-the-board cuts, whether it is a Democratic Governor like in Missouri with Nixon or

when you have Cuomo in New York, they have done across-the-board cuts. Why do they do them? Because it works. It spurs economic growth.

Go back to 1964 with Johnson and the Revenue Act. Why did they lower unemployment and generate revenue growth? Because they cut Federal spending.

There is a benefit to getting your fiscal house in order. While we may have set a goal and met that goal, which I applaud, I continue to say it is not going to be enough while we continue the deficit spending. It is time to get our fiscal house in order.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Executive Order No. 13547 (75 Fed. Reg. 43023, relating to the stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes), including the National Ocean Policy developed under such Executive Order.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to introduce this amendment on behalf of my distinguished colleague and fellow member of the Natural Resources Committee, Representative BILL FLORES of Texas.

The National Ocean Policy, created under Executive Order 13547, was signed by President Obama in 2010 and requires that various bureaucracies work together to essentially "zone the ocean" and the sources thereof, largely affecting the ways in which we utilize our ocean resources and impacting both our marine and inland economy.

□ 1900

You have heard of a land grab. This is an ocean grab.

This is a simple amendment. It says that none of the funds made available by this act can be used to implement, administer, or enforce this executive order.

This policy has large implications for our marine resources, but reaches

much further than the ocean itself. Essentially, a drop of rain that falls on your land could cause the Federal Government to have jurisdiction over your property under the notion that this drop will eventually wind up in the ocean.

That the EPA, along with the Army Corps of Engineers, recently released a "Waters of the U.S." rule which vastly expands the agency's jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act by redefining "navigable waterways" serves as an example. I commend the committee for including a provision in this bill barring the implementation of such a rule.

The National Ocean Policy not only restricts ocean and inland activities, but it deters the intended focus and finances of over 20 Federal agencies that meet as a part of the National Ocean Policy, a council that has no statutory authority to exist and no congressional appropriation.

Both the Natural Resources Committee and the Appropriations Committee have asked for detailed spending reports on this overreaching policy, and neither committee has yet to receive any information.

Numerous and varied industries will suffer as a result of this well-meaning but ill-conceived policy, including but not limited to agriculture, energy, fisheries, mining, and marine retail enterprises, to just name a few. This has the potential to be devastating for coastal communities such as in my district—a coastal district located on the Gulf of Mexico, where the previously mentioned industries play a critical role in our economy.

Those who are affected most by the policy won't have a say or any representation in the rulemaking process because there is no current system of oversight in place for the regional planning agencies created as an arm of the National Ocean Council. Much uncertainty remains regarding program implementation, its impact, the limits of its authority, and lack of true stakeholder involvement.

The President has indicated that he will use his pen and his phone to create policy against the will of Congress, and the National Ocean Policy is a perfect opportunity for him to do so.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to stop excessive regulation and protect our ocean and affiliated inland economies, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment that is offered here today, which would block funding for the implementation of National Ocean Policy.

The National Ocean Policy seeks to improve the coordinated management of our oceans and coasts and to address the most pressing issues facing our

oceans, resources, and coastal communities.

In fact, just 2 weeks ago, there were over 100 different ocean users meeting in Massachusetts to help develop New England's ocean plan. This included lobstermen from Maine, my home State; science educators from New Hampshire, fishermen from Massachusetts, clean energy representatives from Rhode Island, and recreational fishermen from Connecticut, all meeting with Federal and State agencies to talk about how to improve their options for their local businesses, build resiliency for coastal communities in the face of extreme weather events, and maintain the health of the ocean that provides us with goods and services we need and enjoy.

The National Ocean Policy does not call for "zoning" the ocean. Rather, it is a strategy to increase efficiency by bringing stakeholders together and giving citizens and businesses a voice in the decisionmaking process. This policy provides a way for the Federal Government to hear from and to coordinate activities with States, communities, and business owners.

Many State and local interests are eager to coordinate with the Federal Government, and this policy is already helping to make that happen.

Let's be clear. The policy is really about helping agencies like NOAA fisheries work more closely with fishermen and the Navy to coordinate with port communities. Why should we consider prohibiting these critically important relationships between businesses, States, and Federal interests?

The National Ocean Policy helps to ensure that our resources, our culture, our history, and the economic vitality of our communities are fully considered in the decisions concerning our oceans.

I urge my colleagues to join me, and I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Byrne amendment, which would prohibit implementation of the National Ocean Policy, which permits better coordination among Federal agencies responsible for coastal planning.

This amendment, by preventing agencies like the Army Corps of Engineers from coordinating with Federal and State partners, would impede States like Rhode Island, my home State, from managing their own resources in the ways that best fit their needs and priorities, and advancing policies that protect our oceans in a responsible way.

The administration has made it clear that the National Ocean Policy does not create new regulations, supersede current regulations, or modify any agency's established mission, jurisdiction, or authority. Rather, it helps coordinate the implementation of exist-

ing regulations by Federal agencies to establish a more efficient and effective decisionmaking process.

In the Northeast, our Regional Ocean Council has allowed States to pool resources and businesses to have a voice in decisionmaking, and has coordinated with Federal partners to ensure all stakeholders have a voice in the process.

Allowing Federal agencies to coordinate implementation of over 100 ocean laws and giving States and local governments a voice in the ocean planning process is smart public policy, and I urge my colleagues to reject this very misguided amendment.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I want to thank my colleague from Rhode Island for his articulate thoughts and for reinforcing what those of us in coastal communities truly believe.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one more time that this is critically important policy for our country. I am fortunate to represent a State that has some of the highest level of shoreline of any State in the Nation. We have fishermen. We have economic interests on the shore. Everyday, I hear from my constituents who are deeply concerned about the changes that we are facing, whether it is the sea level rising, changing in the fisheries, loss of species, economic issues involving our coastlines, working waterfront—these are serious issues. This represents people's livelihoods. Coastal communities, businesses, our economic interests are here at stake. I can't imagine the idea that we would move backward in National Ocean Policy and that we would lose the opportunity to coordinate on these critical interests, that we would do anything that would endanger the economic development and the economic and cultural future of our communities, our fisheries, and so many businesses that States like mine are completely dependent on.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and recognize that we have severe issues ahead of us and we have a lot of work to do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to read the amendment. It doesn't stop any group of people in any State or any coastal area in this country from working together to do the things they have to do to protect their waters and to use their waters. In fact, it frees them up, because, under this executive order that in this amendment we say we are not going to use the money from this bill to fund, they could be restricted.

In my coastal communities, we do meet together. The Federal Government is not a good partner. In fact, they have been a hindrance to our ability to our use waters. Because there are people in the Federal Government who, unfortunately, believe that the oceans belong to the government, not to the people.

We need to adopt this amendment for coastal communities throughout the

United States of America so that we can protect the people's right to control their own oceans and their own waters so that fishermen and commercial uses and recreational uses of our waters are kept and preserved for communities throughout the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Department of Energy's Climate Model Development and Validation program.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to save taxpayers money, help the Department of Energy avoid duplicative programs, and to ensure its limited resources focus on programs directly related to its mission to ensure energy security for the United States.

This simple amendment would prohibit the use of funds to be used towards the proposed Climate Model Development and Validation program within the Department of Energy.

The duplicative and wasteful nature of this new program has been recognized by several outside spending watchdog groups. My amendment is supported by the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, the American Conservative Union, Eagle Forum, and the Taxpayers Protection Alliance.

The committee has recommended no funding for the new climate model development and validation activity in the report. I commend the committee for this recommendation and their work on this issue.

I feel strongly that the full House of Representatives needs to support the committee recommendation and send a strong message to the Senate that we should not be wasting taxpayer resources on new programs that compete with the private sector and should be funded through private investment.

If funded, this program would be yet another new addition to the ever-growing list of global warming programs that have been instituted and funded all over the Federal Government in recent years. The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service estimates this administration has already squandered \$77 billion from fiscal year 2008 to 2013 studying and trying to develop global climate change regulations.

Consequently, I am very concerned by ongoing efforts by this administration to waste even more taxpayer dollars on new programs for Climate Model Development and Validation.

The President's budget request for this program states:

New investment in Climate Model Development and Validation will enable restructuring the model architecture, new software engineering and computational upgrades, and incorporating scale-aware physics in all model components.

Climate modeling and all of these things are being done by dozens of government, academic, business, and non-profit organizations across the globe. While research and modeling of the Earth's climate and how and why the Earth's climate is changing can be of value, it is not central to the Department's mission.

Considering the extensive work that is being done to research, model, and forecast climate change trends by other areas in government, in the private sector, and internationally, funding for this specific piece of President Obama's climate agenda is not only redundant, it is also inefficient.

I thank the chairman and committee for their work on this bill, and this issue specifically. This amendment is about effective use of taxpayers' money, and I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, this amendment blocks funding for the Department of Energy's Climate Model Development and Validation program. This is climate science denial at its worst.

The world's top scientific institutions are all telling us that we have a rapidly closing window to reduce our carbon pollution before the catastrophic impacts of climate change cannot be avoided.

So far, the world has already warmed by 0.8 degrees Celsius, and we are already seeing the effects of climate change. Most scientists agree that 2 degrees Celsius is the maximum amount we can warm without really dangerous effects, although many scientists now believe that even 2 degrees is far too much, given the effects we are already seeing. But absent dramatic action, we are on track to warm 4 to 6 degrees Celsius by mid-century. That is more than 10 degrees Fahrenheit.

The International Energy Agency has concluded that if the world does not take action to reduce carbon pollution by 2017—just 3 years from now—then it will be virtually impossible to limit warming to 2 degrees Celsius.

How do we know all this? There are multiple lines of evidence, including direct measurements. But scientists also

use sophisticated computer models of how the atmosphere and oceans work and how they respond to different atmospheric concentrations of heat-trapping gases.

For projection of future emissions and their impacts, scientists have made numerous advances by collaborating across academic fields, including climatology, chemistry, biology, economics, energy dynamics, agriculture, scenario building, and risk management.

□ 1915

These projections are critical as they provide guideposts to understanding how quickly and how steeply the world needs to cut carbon pollution in order to avoid the worst effects of climate change.

The goal of the DOE's climate model development and validation program is to further improve the reliability of climate models and equip policymakers and citizens with tools to predict the current and future effects of climate change, such as sea level rise, extreme weather events, and drought.

Mr. GOSAR's amendment scraps this program. It says no to enhancing the reliability of our climate models. It says no to improving our understanding of how the climate is changing. It says no to informing policymakers about the consequences of unmitigated climate change. I think that is absolutely irresponsible.

The amazing thing is that the base bill already zeros out the funding for this program; but, apparently, that isn't enough to satisfy the Republicans' climate denial.

So Mr. GOSAR has offered this amendment to just reiterate the point that the House Republicans reject the overwhelming scientific evidence about climate change. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not about making a statement on climate change or the validity of climate science. This is an amendment about fiscal responsibility and efficiency.

More than 50 universities and academic institutions around the globe are engaged in climate modeling. This particular issue has been addressed very well by the academic and the nonprofit sectors with much greater efficiency and speed than any government bureaucracy can ever look at.

The President has already spent \$77 billion since 2008. This is on top of the billions of dollars being spent by institutions and organizations around the world. Let's start talking about that.

The Nation is currently \$17.5 trillion in debt. The Federal Government spends a trillion more dollars than it takes in.

Fact: more than 50 of the world's leading scientific institutions are already deeply engaged in climate modeling and spending billions of their own dollars on this research.

Fact: Congress must make tough choices to cut duplicative programs in government and get Federal spending under control.

Let's look at these prestigious universities that obviously don't know what they are doing: the University of Colorado at Boulder, Harvard University, MIT, Princeton University, the University of Arizona, Arizona State University, the University of Chicago, the University of California at Berkeley.

Mr. Chairman, the last I looked, these are some of the leading institutions in the country, and I think they know a little bit better than the Federal Government.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have amendment No. 173 at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to award grants or provide funding for high-efficiency toilets or indoor water-efficient toilets.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to save taxpayer money and get the government out of the business of subsidizing expensive toilet exchanges and upgrades that yield highly questionable returns.

This amendment has support from several spending watchdog groups, including the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, Eagle Forum, the Taxpayers Protection Alliance, and Generation Opportunity.

If toilet exchange programs were as efficient as the EPA and Bureau of Reclamation claim, then such products would save consumers so much money and water over time that they would sell themselves in the private marketplace and would not need taxpayer subsidies.

According to the House Committee on Natural Resources, the Bureau of Reclamation's own data show that the agency has awarded a number of questionable grants on these projects since 2005, totaling almost \$2 million.

The Federal expenditures spent on toilet exchange programs include a

\$200,000 grant to San Francisco in 2007 and a \$300,000 grant to Texas and California during 2011.

Further, in 2013, Reclamation awarded nearly \$210,000 for high-efficiency flush valves to be installed on urinals in one city in California as part of its WaterSMART program, despite the fact that the investment on this project is estimated to save only 123 acre-feet of water per year.

For 2014, the agency wishes to grant funds toward a nearly million-dollar project for indoor water-efficient fixtures and toilet upgrades in California. At the same time, Federal policies have allowed for more than 300 billion gallons of water to be diverted into the San Francisco Bay and Pacific Ocean to protect a 3-inch fish, known as the Delta smelt.

If we are truly concerned about saving water, then we should, instead, invest in new infrastructure and water storage projects, including reservoirs, which would yield significantly higher returns on our investment.

Our country's Federal multipurpose dams and reservoirs provide abundant amounts of water and allow for clean hydropower generation. This infrastructure investment helps provide the foundation for economic growth and long-term job security.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration continues to focus solely on conservation and has actually taken action to reduce water storage capacity—actions which include calling for the removal of four privately held dams.

This defies common sense. We should, instead, have a balanced approach that includes both conservation and storage. Expensive toilet exchange programs are not the answer, and here are the facts and figures about those programs.

Customers are eligible for a \$100 rebate for installing 1.28-gallon toilets in exchange for their 1.6-gallon toilets. These new toilets cost between \$200 and \$500 each.

An average toilet is flushed six times per day, while each federally-subsidized upgrade yields about \$7 per year in water and utility savings. Thirty-year mortgages provide quicker returns on investments.

The kicker is these taxpayer-funded toilets are significantly smaller and, in many cases, have to be flushed twice. Furthermore, these government-subsidized toilets are a bad investment, as they eventually leak.

If people are going to spend \$200 to \$500 on new high-efficiency toilets, a \$100 rebate from the Federal Government is not what makes their decisions to purchase the toilets in the first place. At the rate we are subsidizing this program, we may as well be flushing taxpayer dollars down these upgraded toilets.

With this ludicrous return on investment, it should go without saying that these projects are a waste of hard-earned taxpayer money.

I ask you to ponder on the countless ways this money could be spent more wisely, including on investments to increase water storage capacity. This amendment is about the effective use of taxpayer money, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KELLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 210(d)(1)(B)(ii) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2238(d)(1)(B)(ii)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply requires that the harbor maintenance funding provided in this Appropriations bill comply with the recently enacted WRRDA law and that the 10 percent funding requirement for the Great Lakes be met.

The Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014, which this body passed by a 412-4 vote, includes an allocation for the Great Lakes navigation system of 10 percent of harbor maintenance funding provided above the fiscal 2012 baseline, but this amendment is more than about that. This is a bill that really dwells on the Great Lakes.

What a great gift from God this Nation was given with the Great Lakes. One-fifth of the world's freshwater—not one-fifth of Pennsylvania's freshwater and certainly not one-fifth of America's freshwater—but one-fifth of the world's freshwater is in our Great Lakes. There is also a commerce element there.

Now, where does that fit in, and why do we talk about that? Here is why: we are talking about jobs. We are talking about jobs at our Great Lakes. We are talking about 128,000 American jobs, over \$33.6 billion in annual revenue, and it is 3 percent of our Nation's gross domestic product.

This commonsense amendment just directs the Army Corps of Engineers to use the allocated funds as directed.

We talk about the Great Lakes, and we talk about it an awful lot. I think that, sometimes, we forget how great this gift is and what our responsibility is.

Sure, it is a gift from God, but it is up to men to maintain it. This great

body is looking at this opportunity that we have right now to actually direct the funding that makes sure that we can still navigate through our Great Lakes—that we can dredge our harbors, that we can do breakwater maintenance, and that we can do jet-ties, which are all of those things that are necessary to keep that line open.

The Great Lakes are truly our door to the world. It is our responsibility, and it falls on our shoulders right now to support that.

I appreciate the chairman and the ranking member's willingness to consider this amendment, and I appreciate their support for our Great Lakes. I would also like to thank Representative CANDICE MILLER for her great work on the WRRDA bill on behalf of our Great Lakes.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and keep open our Great Lakes to the world.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment.

On this particular issue, applying the referenced WRRDA provision to this fiscal year 2015 bill means that, roughly, \$30 million must be provided for the harbor maintenance of the Great Lakes navigation system.

The underlying bill funds the budget request, which includes approximately \$100 million for the Great Lakes. Therefore, while I believe it is unnecessary, I do not object to this amendment and will support it.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), my good friend.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the chairman for yielding, and I commend Representative KELLY for offering this important effort in highlighting the importance of the Great Lakes.

I feel that you may be the last speaker this evening—I don't know—but we would say "last, but not least," especially for those of us from the Great Lakes, and we love the attention because we most often don't get it.

We had conversations today about oceans and about other parts of the country, and it is just so great to have someone with your commitment to the Great Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, we know it is the largest body of freshwater on the face of the Earth and that commerce moving through the seaways is the shortest distance between the United States, Europe, and ports even on the western side of Africa, if you look at the way the globe actually works.

So to have this kind of work by yourself, by the chairman of our subcommittee—Mr. SIMPSON—by CANDICE MILLER, by Congressman VISCLOSKEY, and by so many others who work on Great Lakes issues is wonderful and to

have this team put together and to see that we have done a better job for our Great Lakes in this bill than in past bills.

By the way, I might say that the lake on which the communities I represent are situated, Lake Erie, is the most drawn upon of the lakes and the most fragile, and we share her with Canada, so it even gets a little more complex, as we move forward.

I just wanted to commend the gentleman, and I thank the chairman for giving me the time. I know the people who are listening from the Great Lakes region greatly appreciate the attention and what we do in this bill to make sure that those lakes are maintained.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, Hudson No. 36.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) None of the amounts made available by this Act may be used for any program not authorized by law as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts under the headings "National Nuclear Security Administration", "Environmental and Other Defense Activities", or "Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to offer an amendment to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill that would prohibit the funding for any program included that is not authorized by law.

For far too long, Congress has continued to appropriate spending on government programs with little to no oversight. Our country has essentially been on autopilot towards a cliff of fiscal and economic disaster.

□ 1930

This has resulted in a massive and out-of-control bureaucracy that is wasteful and inefficient. In this bill alone there are 23 unauthorized programs. Some of these programs were last authorized in 1981, and there are others that have never been authorized. In total, these unauthorized and unchecked programs in this legislation receive around \$25 billion.

With over \$17 trillion in debt, we owe it to our constituents to review each agency and program to determine if they are the best use of taxpayer dollars to serve the public need.

Additionally, the rules of the House require that appropriations may only be made for purposes authorized by law. The prohibition on unauthorized appropriations cannot be enforced because the rules that bring appropriation bills to the floor routinely prevent a point of order from being raised.

My amendment prohibits spending on unauthorized programs, but it exempts defense-related programs because these were authorized by the House when we passed the defense authorization bill in May.

This amendment parallels with my bill, H.R. 3847, the Federal Sunset Act of 2014, which would force Congress to evaluate each agency and program and consider recommendations to reform or abolish specific entities to ensure the best use of our resources.

Mr. Chairman, this type of sweeping reform would dramatically overhaul the way that Washington budgets and spends hard-earned tax dollars and allow Congress to finally take back control, scale back our bloated bureaucracy, and provide accountability to the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I have to tell you that I am sympathetic to what the gentleman is trying to do. It is a concern that I have had for a number of years. And, in fact, a few years ago, when I was chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, we brought down a bill and we completely defunded any listing of new species or designation of critical habitat because the Endangered Species Act hadn't been reauthorized for, like, 26 years or something like that. Our intent was not to get rid of the Endangered Species Act or to get rid of the designation of critical habitat. Our intent was to send the message that the authorizing committees need to do their job.

I was supported in that, actually, by the chairman of the Resources Committee that is in charge of reauthorizing that bill. So far that has not been done. They haven't been able to get it done.

As you know, it is sometimes very difficult to pass reauthorization bills for a lot of these different programs, but many of these different programs are very, very important. I continue to try to seek a way to put pressure on the authorizing committees to actually do their job, to get these done.

So far, just defunding them has not been successful in achieving that, and I don't know why that is. It is frustrating both to me and to the sponsor of this amendment. Yet this amendment would do great damage to the Department of Energy. And I guess you could use this government-wide.

There are a lot of programs. You would be surprised which programs haven't been reauthorized. I think the

Department of State hasn't been reauthorized. Most seniors programs have not been reauthorized. If we can find a way to put pressure on the authorizing committees to do this, I would be more than happy to work with the gentleman to try to accomplish that goal, but ending the programs this way, I think, would be too dramatic of an effect.

So, while I sympathize with what the gentleman is trying to do, I have to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 7.4831 percent.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply to amounts under the headings "National Nuclear Security Administration", "Environmental and Other Defense Activities", or "Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 641, the gentleman from North Carolina and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to offer an amendment to the Energy and Water Appropriations bill that would cut spending back to the fiscal year 2008 level.

While I appreciate the work of the Appropriations Committee in crafting this important bill that does decrease spending, we must all recognize that a cut of \$50 million is a rounding error here in Washington.

My amendment makes an across-the-board cut of 7.48 percent to the bill in order to decrease the amount back to the fiscal year 2008 level. The Congressional Budget Office confirms my amendment would reduce budget authority by \$1.34 billion. Defense accounts are exempt from these savings because this House just addressed defense programs in the National Defense Authorization Act a few months ago.

Mr. Chairman, we are on a path to a horrific debt crisis in this country. When I ran for Congress, I repeatedly said the first step we must take to reduce spending and get our fiscal house in order is to go back to 2008 levels, and then let's go program by program and find savings, find duplicative programs that we need to cut, find the waste.

Again, Mr. Chairman, we have got to get our fiscal house in order, get ourselves back on track. My amendment

does just that, allows us to return to a point where we can finally get serious about making real substantive cuts to begin to pay down our debt and save future generations from this horrific debt crisis that we are on a collision course with as things now stand.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I guess the first question I would ask is: Why 2008 spending levels? Why not 2006 or 2004 or 2000 or 1998 spending levels, or 1972 or 1900?

What we need to do is look at what we are spending now and create savings by deciding what is important and what we ought to be doing and what are those things that we might like to do but we just don't have the money to do, and eliminate those programs or reduce the spending in many of those programs, which is what the Appropriations Committee does every day.

When these bills come down here, we have had hearings on the different functions of the Federal Government. And believe me, if you or I were to sit down and discuss what the Federal Government ought to be doing, we would agree on a lot. There would be things we would disagree on that I think are essential and things that I would disagree that you would think were essential. We have 435 Members, represent all corners of this country, and a budget is, by its very nature, a compromise in those different opinions on what ought to be funded and what the proper role of government is.

One thing we do know, that we are \$17 trillion in debt, and that a portion of that, a portion of the solution, is reducing our discretionary spending. We have been doing that for the last 4 years, and it has been hard work by the Appropriations Committee.

We also know that you cannot get this budget to balance, no matter how hard you try, by reducing discretionary spending. It is not large enough, in the overall context of things, to cut it enough to get the budget to balance. You have got to do other things. You have got to have tax reform. You have got to have entitlement reform. We have to look at every area that the government is spending. Right now, I think it is about 28 percent of the total expenditures of the Federal Government are discretionary spending. About 72 percent of them are mandatory. They are on autopilot. They just go on unless we change the underlying law.

So we have got to have the courage to address a lot of the things that are driving our debt. I will tell you, you will never balance this budget until you get the economy growing again. That is the reality.

When you looked at the late 1990s, when President Clinton and a Republican Congress balanced the budget—or

at least that is who was in charge at the time. We can argue about who balanced it. But at that period of time, it wasn't because Republicans were so conservative that they came in and reduced spending and the budget all of a sudden got balanced, or it wasn't that President Clinton came in and just raised taxes and everything and all of sudden we had a ton more revenue. What it was is that the economy grew, and I mean it boomed.

We had the dot-com bubble, if you remember, where we had more money coming in to the Federal Government than we knew what to do with. In fact, when we talked about paying off the national debt at the time, I actually heard debates from leading economists that said we could pay off the national debt too fast—we had that much money coming in—because the debts wouldn't come due when all the money was coming in.

But then, of course, that turned around when the dot-com bubble burst, and since that, then 9/11 happened and a whole bunch of other things and two wars and et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

The reality is that you can't balance this budget simply by reducing discretionary spending, but I will tell you that the Appropriations Committee has been doing their job. They have been looking at the proper role of Federal Government, what our responsibilities are, what we must fund, and what we should fund, and also at what we would like to do and sometimes just don't have the money to do. So those are the difficult decisions we have been making, and we continue to do that.

This type of approach, I think, that would take these accounts, only some accounts, back to the 1998 levels, I think, would hurt our economy. And, in fact, one of the big parts of our account is the Army Corps of Engineers, which does water infrastructure, locks, dams, harbor maintenance, all of that kind of stuff which is vital to our economy. I don't know that you want to go in and cut that by 7.8 percent. The President proposed a \$1 billion cut in it, a huge cut in it. We restored it because we, both Republicans and Democrats, realize how important the water infrastructure of this country is.

Those are the decisions that we make on the Appropriations Committee, a committee that I am proud to serve on, that has made, over the last several years, some very, very difficult decisions, and will continue to do so because, just like every Member of this Congress, we realize we can't continue racking up the debt as we have over the last several decades.

So I appreciate that, and I would oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in opposition to the gentle-

man's well-intentioned amendment, and it is obvious he pays attention to the math.

What is important about the math of our deficit is that we haven't been growing fast enough to meet the needs of this country. We have a demand problem among vast numbers of the American people who aren't consuming as fast as they used to because they have lost their jobs, they have lost their equity because of the housing crisis, and because, if they have gone back to work, they aren't earning as much as they used to earn. The middle class is shrinking, as you well know, and the ranks of the poor are growing. So we have a demand problem in this society.

The energy question, and the reason I am opposing your amendment is because our budget, our allocation is about \$34 billion. If you look just at this year, we will have over \$200 billion in imported energy that sucks the wealth out of this country and sends it somewhere else. The portion of our bill that deals with energy is not \$34 billion, but maybe a third of that. So you have got maybe 10, 12 billion, \$15 billion at the most in our bill that deals directly with energy versus over \$200 billion in terms of energy imports. So we are way out of balance as a society.

The portion of the investment that we make here to invent a new energy future is moving us in the right direction but too slowly.

So do I feel we are going to meet the needs that we need to for the future? I fear our generation is failing the next, as hard as we try here. If I look at the progress we have made, in 1998, that was the first year where America imported over half its energy. The decade before that it had been about 40 percent. Before that, the last 30 years we have hemorrhaged in bringing all this stuff in. This year, about 40 percent of what we consume will be imported. So we have moved from 1998, importing 50 percent of what we used, to 40 percent.

I think President Obama has made a difference. Some of my colleagues may not agree with that. But with drilling, opening up drilling on lands across this country, we have begun to close the gap.

Drilling our way out of this is not a total solution. We need new energy technologies. This bill moves us in that direction.

Don't allow your amendment to stop us from increasing our ability to become energy independent again and create the kind of demand inside this economy that will create the jobs that we need for the future to heal our middle class and move people out the ranks of poverty. So you are well-intentioned, but I think you are out of focus in terms of where the real challenge lies.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from my colleagues. I appreciate, particularly, the work Chairman SIMPSON and his staff

have done preparing this bill. I understand the challenges they face, and I appreciate the cuts they have made.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are on a path to absolute ruin in this country. If we don't spend one new dollar, we are headed toward a fiscal crisis in a very short time, and we have got to get off that path. One way to do it is to go back to 2008 spending levels, and then let's do the work that the Appropriations Committee has done on this bill. Let's start at 2008 and look at which programs we want to keep, which programs are duplicative, where is the waste.

□ 1945

But we have got to start somewhere. And, frankly, \$50 million is a start, but it is not a big enough start. So I would encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be postponed.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1959

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 641 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4923.

Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) kindly take the chair.

□ 2000

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Ms. FOXX (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on an amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), had been postponed and the bill had been read through page 59, line 20.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. LAMALFA of California.

An amendment by Mr. STOCKMAN of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. STOCKMAN of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. MCKINLEY of West Virginia.

Amendment No. 22 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

An amendment by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

An amendment by Mr. HUDSON of North Carolina.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 193, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

AYES—226

Amash	Bachus	Barton
Amodei	Barletta	Benish
Bachmann	Barr	Bentivolio

Bilirakis	Guthrie	Petri
Bishop (UT)	Hall	Pittenger
Black	Harper	Pitts
Blackburn	Harris	Poe (TX)
Boustany	Hartzler	Posey
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Bridenstine	Heck (NV)	Rahall
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Reed
Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Broun (GA)	Holding	Ribble
Buchanan	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Huelskamp	Rigell
Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Byrne	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Calvert	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Camp	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Campbell	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Cantor	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Capito	Johnson (OH)	Rokita
Carter	Johnson, Sam	Rooney
Cassidy	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Jordan	Roskam
Chaffetz	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Clawson (FL)	King (IA)	Rothfus
Coble	King (NY)	Royce
Coffman	Kingston	Runyan
Cole	Kinzing (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Collins (GA)	Kline	Salmon
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Sanford
Conaway	LaMalfa	Scalise
Cook	Lamborn	Schock
Cotton	Lance	Schweikert
Cramer	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Crawford	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	Latta	Sessions
Culberson	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Daines	Long	Shuster
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Simpson
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Dent	Lummis	Smith (NE)
DeSantis	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Marino	Smith (TX)
Duffy	Massie	Southerland
Duncan (SC)	McAllister	Stewart
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Stivers
Ellmers	McCaul	Stockman
Farenthold	McClintock	Terry
Fincher	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Fitzpatrick	McIntyre	Thornberry
Fleischmann	McKeon	Tiberi
Fleming	McKinley	Tipton
Flores	McMorris	Turner
Forbes	Rodgers	Upton
Fortenberry	Meadows	Valadao
Fox	Meehan	Walberg
Franks (AZ)	Messer	Walden
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Walorski
Gardner	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Gerlach	Miller, Gary	Wenstrup
Gibbs	Mullin	Westmoreland
Gibson	Mulvaney	Whitfield
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Williams
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Goodlatte	Noem	Wittman
Gosar	Nugent	Wolf
Gowdy	Nunes	Womack
Granger	Olson	Woodall
Graves (GA)	Palazzo	Yoder
Graves (MO)	Paulsen	Yoho
Griffith (AR)	Pearce	Young (AK)
Griffith (VA)	Perry	Young (IN)
Grimm	Peterson	

NOES—193

Barber	Cicilline	Doggett
Barrow (GA)	Clark (MA)	Doyle
Bass	Clarke (NY)	Duckworth
Beatty	Clay	Edwards
Becerra	Cleaver	Ellison
Bera (CA)	Clyburn	Engel
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Enyart
Bishop (NY)	Connolly	Eshoo
Blumenauer	Conyers	Esty
Bonamici	Cooper	Farr
Brady (PA)	Costa	Fattah
Braley (IA)	Courtney	Foster
Brown (FL)	Crowley	Frankel (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Cuellar	Fudge
Bustos	Cummings	Gabbard
Butterfield	Davis (CA)	Galleo
Capps	Davis, Danny	Garamendi
Capuano	DeFazio	Garcia
Cardenas	DeGette	Grayson
Carson (IN)	Delaney	Green, Al
Cartwright	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Castor (FL)	DelBene	Grijalva
Castro (TX)	Deutch	Gutiérrez
Chu	Dingell	Hahn

Hanna
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei

Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reichert
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swaikwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Joyce

Langevin
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Rangel

Richmond
Stutzman
Wagner

□ 2029

Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. JOLLY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. SHUSTER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 393 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Stated against:

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Chair, on rollcall 393 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 182, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

AYES—239

Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Olson

Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souterland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—182

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps

Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciocline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn

Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis

Price (NC)
Quigley
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swaikwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
Hanabusa

McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Rangel

Reichert
Richmond
Stutzman

□ 2035

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STOCKMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STOCKMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 282, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

AYES—140

Amash
Bachmann
Bachus
Bentivolio
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn

Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Burgess

Byrne
Campbell
Cantor
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz

Clawson (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Pittenger	McGovern	Reichert	Stivers	Crawford	Joyce	Ribble
Coble	Jones	Pitts	McIntyre	Renacci	Swalwell (CA)	Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
Coffman	Jordan	Poe (TX)	McNerney	Rigell	Takano	Culberson	King (IA)	Rigell
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Posey	Meehan	Roby	Terry	Daines	Kingston	Roby
Conaway	Labrador	Ribble	Meeks	Roe (TN)	Thompson (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)
Cook	LaMalfa	Rice (SC)	Meng	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Denham	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Cotton	Lamborn	Rohrabacher	Michaud	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)	Dent	Labrador	Rogers (KY)
Daines	Lance	Rokita	Miller, George	Rogers (MI)	Tierney	DeSantis	LaMalfa	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Rodney	Lankford	Rooney	Moore	Ros-Lehtinen	Tipton	Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Denham	Latta	Roskam	Moran	Roybal-Allard	Titus	Duffy	Lance	Rokita
DeSantis	LoBiondo	Ross	Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Tonko	Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Rooney
Duffy	Long	Rothfus	Murphy (PA)	Runyan	Tsongas	Duncan (TN)	Latham	Roskam
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Royce	Nadler	Ruppersberger	Turner	Ellmers	Latta	Ross
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (WI)	Napolitano	Rush	Upton	Farenthold	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Farenthold	Lummis	Salmon	Neal	Ryan (OH)	Valadao	Fincher	Long	Royce
Fincher	Marchant	Sanford	Negrete McLeod	Sánchez, Linda T.	Van Hollen	Fleischmann	Lucas	Ryan (WI)
Fleischmann	Massie	Scalise	Noem	Sanchez, Loretta	Vargas	Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Salmon
Fleming	McCarthy (CA)	Schweikert	Nolan	Sarbanes	Veasey	Flores	Lummis	Sanford
Flores	McCaul	Scott, Austin	O'Rourke	Schakowsky	Vela	Forbes	Marchant	Scalise
Forbes	McClintock	Sensenbrenner	Owens	Schiff	Velázquez	Fortenberry	Marino	Schock
Fox	McHenry	Sessions	Pallone	Schneider	Visclosky	Fox	Massie	Schweikert
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Smith (MO)	Pascrell	Schock	Walden	Franks (AZ)	McAllister	Scott, Austin
Garrett	McKinley	Smith (NE)	Pastor (AZ)	Schrader	Walorski	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Gohmert	McMorris	Smith (NJ)	Paulsen	Schwartz	Walz	Gardner	McCaul	Sessions
Gosar	Rodgers	Smith (TX)	Payne	Scott (VA)	Wasserman	Garrett	McClintock	Simpson
Gowdy	Meadows	Southerland	Pelosi	Scott, David	Schultz	Gerlach	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Graves (GA)	Messer	Stewart	Perlmutter	Serrano	Waters	Gibbs	McIntyre	Smith (NE)
Graves (MO)	Mica	Stockman	Peters (CA)	Sewell (AL)	Waxman	Gingrey (GA)	McKeon	Smith (NJ)
Griffin (AR)	Miller (FL)	Thornberry	Peters (MI)	Shea-Porter	Webster (FL)	Gohmert	McKinley	Smith (TX)
Grimm	Miller (MI)	Tiberi	Peterson	Sherman	Welch	Goodlatte	McMorris	Southerland
Hall	Miller, Gary	Wagner	Petri	Shimkus	Wenstrup	Gosar	Rodgers	Stewart
Harris	Mullin	Walberg	Pingree (ME)	Shuster	Whitfield	Gowdy	Meadows	Stivers
Hensarling	Mulvaney	Weber (TX)	Pocan	Simpson	Wilson (FL)	Granger	Meehan	Stockman
Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer	Westmoreland	Polis	Sinema	Wilson (SC)	Graves (GA)	Messer	Terry
Hudson	Nugent	Williams	Price (GA)	Sires	Wolf	Graves (MO)	Mica	Thompson (PA)
Huelskamp	Nunes	Wittman	Price (NC)	Slaughter	Womack	Griffin (AR)	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Huizenga (MI)	Olson	Woodall	Quigley	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth	Griffith (VA)	Miller (MI)	Tiberi
Hultgren	Palazzo	Yoder	Rahall	Speith	Young (AK)	Grimm	Miller, Gary	Tipton
Hurt	Pearce	Yoho	Reed			Guthrie	Mullin	Turner
Jenkins	Perry	Young (IN)				Hall	Mulvaney	Upton

NOES—282

Amodei	Davis, Danny	Holding
Barber	DeFazio	Holt
Barletta	DeGette	Honda
Barr	Delaney	Horsford
Barrow (GA)	DeLauro	Hoyer
Barton	DelBene	Huffman
Bass	Dent	Hunter
Beatty	Deutch	Israel
Becerra	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Benishek	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Bera (CA)	Doggett	Jeffries
Bilirakis	Doyle	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Duckworth	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (NY)	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Ellison	Jolly
Bonamici	Ellmers	Joyce
Brady (PA)	Engel	Kaptur
Braley (IA)	Enyart	Keating
Brooks (IN)	Eshoo	Kelly (IL)
Brown (FL)	Esty	Kelly (PA)
Brownley (CA)	Farr	Kennedy
Bucshon	Fattah	Kildee
Bustos	Fitzpatrick	Kilmer
Butterfield	Fortenberry	Kind
Calvert	Foster	King (IA)
Camp	Frankel (FL)	King (NY)
Capito	Frelinghuysen	Kinzinger (IL)
Capps	Fudge	Kirkpatrick
Capuano	Gabbard	Kline
Cárdenas	Gallego	Kuster
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Langevin
Cartwright	Garcia	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Gardner	Larson (CT)
Castro (TX)	Gerlach	Latham
Chu	Gibbs	Lee (CA)
Cicilline	Gibson	Levin
Clark (MA)	Gingrey (GA)	Lewis
Clarke (NY)	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Clay	Granger	Loebsack
Cleaver	Grayson	Lofgren
Clyburn	Green, Al	Lowenthal
Cohen	Green, Gene	Lowey
Cole	Griffith (VA)	
Collins (NY)	Grijalva	
Connolly	Guthrie	
Conyers	Gutiérrez	
Cooper	Hahn	
Costa	Hanna	
Courtney	Harper	
Cramer	Hartzler	
Crawford	Hastings (FL)	
Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)	
Crowley	Heck (NV)	
Cuellar	Heck (WA)	
Culberson	Higgins	
Cummings	Himes	
Davis (CA)	Hinojosa	

NOT VOTING—10

Aderholt	McCarthy (NY)	Richmond
Carney	Nunnelee	Stutzman
DesJarlais	Pompeo	
Hanabusa	Rangel	

□ 2039

Mr. PITTENGER changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STOCKMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STOCKMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 204, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

AYES—218

Amash	Bridenstine	Cassidy
Amodei	Brooks (AL)	Chabot
Bachmann	Brooks (IN)	Chaffetz
Bachus	Broun (GA)	Clawson (FL)
Barletta	Buchanan	Coble
Barr	Bucshon	Coffman
Barton	Burgess	Cole
Benishek	Byrne	Collins (GA)
Bentivoglio	Calvert	Collins (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Camp	Conaway
Black	Campbell	Cook
Blackburn	Cantor	Costa
Boustany	Capito	Cotton
Brady (TX)	Carter	Cramer

NOES—204

Barber	Cummings	Heck (WA)
Barrow (GA)	Davis (CA)	Herrera Beutler
Bass	Davis, Danny	Higgins
Beatty	DeFazio	Himes
Becerra	DeGette	Hinojosa
Bera (CA)	Delaney	Holt
Bilirakis	DeLauro	Honda
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Horsford
Bishop (NY)	Deutch	Hoyer
Blumenauer	Dingell	Huffman
Bonamici	Doggett	Israel
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Jackson Lee
Braley (IA)	Duckworth	Jeffries
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Johnson (GA)
Brownley (CA)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Bustos	Engel	Jolly
Butterfield	Enyart	Kaptur
Capps	Eshoo	Keating
Capuano	Esty	Kelly (IL)
Cárdenas	Farr	Kennedy
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Kildee
Cartwright	Fitzpatrick	Kilmer
Castor (FL)	Foster	Kind
Castro (TX)	Frankel (FL)	King (NY)
Chu	Fudge	Kirkpatrick
Cicilline	Gabbard	Kuster
Clark (MA)	Gallego	Langevin
Clarke (NY)	Garamendi	Larsen (WA)
Clay	Garcia	Larson (CT)
Cleaver	Gibson	Lee (CA)
Clyburn	Grayson	Levin
Cohen	Green, Al	Lewis
Connolly	Green, Gene	Lipinski
Conyers	Grijalva	Loebsack
Cooper	Gutiérrez	Lofgren
Courtney	Hahn	Lowenthal
Crowley	Hanna	Lowey
Cuellar	Hastings (FL)	

Lujan Grisham (NM)	Payne	Shea-Porter	Gingrey (GA)	Massie	Roskam	O'Rourke	Sánchez, Linda T.	Takano
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Pelosi	Sherman	Gohmert	Matheson	Ross	Owens	T.	Thompson (CA)
Lynch (NM)	Perlmutter	Shimkus	Goodlatte	McAllister	Rothfus	Pallone	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (MS)
Maffei	Peters (CA)	Shuster	Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)	Royce	Pascarell	Sarbanes	Tierney
Maloney, Carolyn	Peters (MI)	Sinema	Granger	McCaul	Runyan	Pastor (AZ)	Schakowsky	Titus
Maloney, Sean	Peterson	Sires	Graves (GA)	McClintock	Ryan (WI)	Payne	Schiff	Tonko
Matheson	Pingree (ME)	Slaughter	Graves (MO)	McHenry	Salmon	Pelosi	Schneider	Tsongas
Matsui	Pocan	Smith (WA)	Griffin (AR)	McKeon	Sanford	Perlmutter	Schrader	Van Hollen
McCollum	Polis	Speier	Griffith (VA)	McKinley	Scalise	Peters (CA)	Schwartz	Vargas
McDermott	Price (NC)	Swallowell (CA)	Grimm	McMorris	Schock	Peters (MI)	Scott (VA)	Veasey
McGovern	Quigley	Takano	Guthrie	Rodgers	Schweikert	Pingree (ME)	Scott, David	Vela
McNerney	Rahall	Thompson (CA)	Hall	Meadows	Scott, Austin	Pocan	Serrano	Velázquez
Meeks	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (MS)	Hanna	Meehan	Sensenbrenner	Polis	Sewell (AL)	Visclosky
Meng	Roybal-Allard	Tierney	Harper	Messer	Sessions	Price (NC)	Shea-Porter	Walz
Michaud	Ruiz	Titus	Harris	Mica	Shimkus	Quigley	Sherman	Wasserman
Miller, George	Runyan	Tonko	Hartzler	Miller (FL)	Shuster	Roybal-Allard	Sinema	Schultz
Moore	Ruppersberger	Tsongas	Hastings (WA)	Miller (MI)	Simpson	Ruiz	Sires	Waters
Moran	Rush	Van Hollen	Heck (NV)	Miller, Gary	Smith (MO)	Ruppersberger	Slaughter	Waxman
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Vargas	Hensarling	Mullin	Smith (NE)	Rush	Smith (WA)	Welch
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda T.	Veasey	Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney	Smith (NJ)	Ryan (OH)	Speier	Yarmuth
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Vela	Holding	Murphy (PA)	Smith (TX)		Swallowell (CA)	
Neal	Sarbanes	Velázquez	Hudson	Neugebauer	Southerland			
Negrete McLeod	Schakowsky	Visclosky	Huelskamp	Noem	Stewart			
Nolan	Schiff	Walz	Hultgren	Nugent	Stivers			
O'Rourke	Schneider	Wasserman	Hunter	Nunes	Stockman			
Owens	Schrader	Schultz	Issa	Olson	Terry			
Pallone	Schwartz	Waters	Jenkins	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)			
Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Waxman	Johnson (OH)	Paulsen	Thornberry			
Pastor (AZ)	Scott, David	Welch	Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Tiberi			
	Serrano	Wilson (FL)	Jolly	Perry	Tipton			
	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth	Jones	Peterson	Turner			
			Jordan	Petri	Upton			
			Joyce	Pittenger	Valadao			
			Kelly (PA)	Pitts	Wagner			
			King (IA)	Poe (TX)	Walberg			
			King (NY)	Posey	Walden			
			Kingston	Price (GA)	Walorski			
			Kinzing (IL)	Rahall	Weber (TX)			
			Kline	Reed	Webster (FL)			
			Labrador	Reichert	Wenstrup			
			LaMalfa	Renacci	Westmoreland			
			Lamborn	Ribble	Whitfield			
			Lance	Rice (SC)	Williams			
			Lankford	Rigell	Wilson (SC)			
			Latham	Roby	Wittman			
			Latta	Roe (TN)	Wolf			
			LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	Womack			
			Long	Rogers (KY)	Woodall			
			Lucas	Rogers (MI)	Yoder			
			Luetkemeyer	Rohrabacher	Yoho			
			Lummis	Rokita	Young (AK)			
			Marchant	Rooney	Young (IN)			
			Marino	Ros-Lehtinen				

NOT VOTING—10

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
Hanabusa

McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee
Pompeo
Rangel

Richmond
Stutzman

□ 2042

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 188, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

AYES—229

Amash
Amodi
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buchon
Burgess
Byrne

Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines

Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs

Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene

NOES—188

Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating

Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan

NOT VOTING—15

Huizenga (MI)
Hurt
McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Nunnelee

Pompeo
Rangel
Richmond
Stutzman
Wilson (FL)

□ 2046

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 397 there was a technical issue with my voting card and I was detained getting to the well of the House to vote by physical card. I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 150, noes 271, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

AYES—150

Amash
Barton
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Buchon
Burgess
Byrne
Camp
Campbell
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)

Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Daines
DeSantis
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)

Griffith (VA)
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn

Lance
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Olson

NOES—271

Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth

Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Posey
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rothfus
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stockman
Terry
Tiberi
Tipton
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

Levin
Lewis
Ellison
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Esty
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McAllister
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Roybal-Allard

Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
Hanabusa

Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas

NOT VOTING—11

McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee
Pittenger
Pompeo

□ 2050

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PITTENGHER. Madam Chair, on rollcall No. 398, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 194, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 399]

AYES—226

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Cassidy

Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming

Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers

Rangel
Richmond
Stutzman
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)

NOES—194

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Jeffries
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth

Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin

Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reichert
Roybal-Allard

Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano

Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas

Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Tipton
Walberg
Walorski
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters

Waxman
Welch
Wenstrup
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)

Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—289

Amodei
Bachmann
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishke
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)

Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
DeLaney
DeLauro
DelBeno
Denham
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard

Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Granger
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanna
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, Gary

Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Larsen (WA)
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
DesJarlais

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
DesJarlais

Hanabusa
King (NY)
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee

Pompeo
Rangel
Richmond
Stutzman

□ 2058

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will read the last three lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015”.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4923) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, directed her to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under House Resolution 641, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 2100

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ENYART. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Enyart moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4923 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

NOT VOTING—12

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
Hanabusa

McCarthy (NY)
McIntyre
Nunnelee
Pompeo

Rangel
Richmond
Stutzman
Webster (FL)

□ 2054

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 289, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 400]

AYES—131

Amash
Bachus
Barton
Bentivolio
Billirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Burgess
Byrne
Campbell
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Daines
DeSantis
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar

Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Guthrie
Harper
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latta
Long
Lucas
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica

Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stockman
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi

Page 19, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 26, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 27, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$20,000,000)”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill, as amended, will immediately proceed to final passage. Today, we come together to vote on an amendment that will not only create infrastructure, but create much-needed jobs as well.

Before joining the ranks of Congress last year, I served in the ranks of our Nation's military. As a commander of the Illinois National Guard, I oversaw the largest deployment of troops overseas since World War II.

Also well known across the State and particularly along Illinois' Mississippi River border were the efforts of men and women of the Illinois National Guard during flood season—efforts, resources, and dollars that can be saved with the preventative measures funded in this amendment.

The amendment before us today provides an additional \$10 million to the Army Corps of Engineers for projects that could include levee construction, levee repair, flood mitigation, and flood prevention.

Too often, I sent those guardsmen and -women to fight floodwaters from the Mississippi River. Too often, I have seen levees break, rivers flow over their banks, and sandbags give way; and all too often, I have seen the aftereffects of destroyed homes, lost belongings, and the anguish of starting over again.

Just in the past week, three bridges across the Mississippi River have been closed due to flooding. Twenty roads, highways, and interstates have been closed or temporarily shuttered in Illinois alone, due to floodwaters, and the Mississippi River is expected to crest 10 feet above flood stage in some areas this week.

This isn't just a Midwestern issue. In the past 5 years, every single State in our great Nation has experienced floods or flash flooding.

Every dollar that we send to the Army Corps to prevent flooding will be put back into our economy if American families are spared the expense of flood cleanup. We must pass this amendment to provide critical dollars to the Army Corps, while creating good-paying jobs for men and women across our Nation.

This amendment makes all the difference for the people of Alton, Illinois, where the Mississippi River is at flood stage this week.

This amendment makes all the difference for the people of Grand Tower, Illinois, where the Army Corps doesn't have the funding to fix the structural inadequacies of the levees the Corps built 60 years ago. Communities are depending on us for leadership.

Also included in this amendment is an additional \$10 million for the energy efficiency and renewable energy account. Current language in the bill is almost \$113 million less than in 2014 and \$530 million less than the administration's request.

We simply cannot afford such harsh reductions in funding for an area where our country desperately needs growth: energy efficiency and independence. A great example of energy-efficient infrastructure and operations is at Southern Illinois University, which is in my home district and is my alma mater.

SIU is committed to sustainability and green operations across campus. The university believes that higher education should be ecologically sound, socially just, and economically viable, giving students a healthy environment in which to live and learn.

SIU was, again, named a Green College by the Princeton Review. SIU maintains green jobs and green processes through their vermicomposting center—designed to take food scraps from dormitories and turn them into compost for campus gardens. The new transportation education center earned an LEED silver certificate. It is programs like these that this amendment will support.

Like all of you, I had the opportunity to listen to my constituents this past week. Over and over again, my constituents stopped me to ask: Why do we spend billions of tax dollars to build and rebuild other nations around the world, while so many of our critical improvements need to be made here at home?

This amendment won't address all of those needs here in America, but it is an improvement to this Appropriations bill and an investment in the long-term needs of our country.

I urge you to vote “yes” for flood safety, to vote “yes” for jobs, to vote “yes” for energy independence. I urge you to vote “yes” for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish the gentleman who just spoke would call the administration. His budget request was nearly \$1 billion below last year's for the Army Corps of Engineers. That is what the administration proposed to us.

We restored that and, in fact, increased last year's Army Corps of Engineers budget by \$25 million while, at the same time, cutting \$50 million out of the overall bill, so I wish he would talk to the administration about its budget request.

This is a balanced bill, made more balanced by the 2 days of amendments we have debated—some accepted, some not accepted—from all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

We have already taken \$45 million out of the DA account. I know it is an

easy account to target, to just take money out of, but at some point in time, you have to stop, and we have already taken \$45 million out of the DA account.

An important characteristic of any Member of this body is to know when to talk and when to shut up. It is after 9. I encourage my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit and for the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 231, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 401]

AYES—188

Barber	Enyart	Luján, Ben Ray
Barrow (GA)	Eshoo	(NM)
Bass	Esty	Lynch
Beatty	Farr	Maffei
Becerra	Fattah	Maloney,
Bera (CA)	Foster	Carolyn
Bishop (GA)	Frankel (FL)	Maloney, Sean
Bishop (NY)	Fudge	Matheson
Blumenauer	Gabbard	Matsui
Bonamici	Gallego	McCollum
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	McDermott
Braley (IA)	Garcia	McGovern
Brown (FL)	Grayson	McIntyre
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al	McNerney
Bustos	Green, Gene	Meeks
Butterfield	Grijalva	Meng
Capps	Gutiérrez	Michaud
Capuano	Hahn	Miller, George
Cárdenas	Hastings (FL)	Moore
Carson (IN)	Heck (WA)	Murphy (FL)
Cartwright	Higgins	Nadler
Castor (FL)	Himes	Napolitano
Castro (TX)	Hinojosa	Neal
Chu	Holt	Negrete McLeod
Cicilline	Honda	Nolan
Clark (MA)	Horsford	O'Rourke
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	Owens
Clay	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Cleaver	Jeffries	Pascrell
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Conyers	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Cooper	Keating	Peters (CA)
Costa	Kelly (IL)	Peters (MI)
Courtney	Kennedy	Pingree (ME)
Crowley	Kildee	Pocan
Cuellar	Kilmer	Polis
Cummings	Kind	Price (NC)
Davis (CA)	Kirkpatrick	Quigley
Davis, Danny	Kuster	Rahall
DeFazio	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Rush
DelBene	Levin	Ryan (OH)
Deutch	Lewis	Sánchez, Linda
Dingell	Lipinski	T.
Doggett	Loeb	Sanchez, Loretta
Doyle	Lofgren	Sarbanes
Duckworth	Lowenthal	Schakowsky
Edwards	Lowey	Schiff
Ellison	Lujan Grisham	Schneider
Engel	(NM)	Schrader

Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier

Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela

Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 2115

Mr. SWALWELL of California changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 170, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

YEAS—253

NOES—231

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Billrakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)
Griffith (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Walberg
Walden
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce

Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Crenshaw
Culler
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Billrakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culler
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner

Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley

Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Visclosky

Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—170

Amash
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Grayson

Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Labrador
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Dingell
Massie
Matheson
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Negrete McLeod
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wenstrup
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais

Hanabusa
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee

Pompeo
Rangel
Richmond

□ 2122

Mr. LOWENTHAL changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 10, I was unavoidably detained in my State on official business until 8:00 p.m. tonight, and I would like to indicate how I would have voted had I been present.

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt
Carney
DesJarlais
Gibson
Hanabusa

Hoyer
Israel
McCarthy (NY)
Nunnelee
Pelosi

Pompeo
Rangel
Richmond

On rollcall vote No. 379, under the bill H.R. 4923, Energy and Water Appropriations Act, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 380, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 381, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 382, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 383, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 384, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 385, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 386, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 387, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote No. 388, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 389, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 390, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 391, I would have voted "no."

On rollcall vote No. 392, I would have voted "no."

STRENGTHENING TRANSPARENCY IN HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined my colleague, Mr. MESSER, to introduce the Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act, legislation which will ensure useful information is easily accessible, deliver data that includes the entire college population, and improve coordination between Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, students and families must wade through massive and often conflicting amounts of information in order to make informed college decisions. The Higher Education Act, HEA, alone requires 26 different categories of information be available, and there are many additional State and Federal requirements.

Our bill will streamline the overwhelming maze of information with a consumer-tested College Dashboard. The College Dashboard will provide students with key information, enrollment, completion, net price, and average loan debt and Bureau of Labor Statistics wage data.

With college costs steadily rising, prospective students need to make informed decisions about their future. The Strengthening Transparency in Higher Education Act will help them do just that.

WORKING ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is our job to work on behalf of the American people, and in H.R. 4923, I am

very pleased to note that two Jackson Lee amendments passed that I think will expand the opportunities for small businesses and promote the environment.

One amendment, of course, increased funding for the Office of Minority Economic Impact to be able to reach out to small businesses, MWBEs, in order to create jobs, a challenge that the American people asked us to meet.

My second amendment that was accepted in a bipartisan manner reprograms funds for the Department of Energy's departmental administration to increase support for environmental justice. That is very important to very many sites in the 18th Congressional District, from northeast to southeast.

As you well know, Mr. Speaker, I also was able to get an amendment in the bill dealing with the Department of the Interior and set up an office on minority business and contracting and outreach for jobs.

We must create more jobs. We must help create more jobs, and leading out by this Nation to create more jobs is very important.

I am also pleased that the dredging funding that the Houston Port needed was put in this bill, joined by my colleagues from the Houston delegation. Now the Houston Port will be able to continue to serve as one of the largest ports in the world.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that this legislation had these elements in it. I look forward to the bill going to the Senate so that we can come back and vote for this bill.

FIREFIGHTER DANIEL GROOVER, FIRE STATION 104, HOUSTON, TEXAS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when there is a blaze, when there is a fire, when there is an explosion, when someone has an emergency medical problem, the firefighters rush in. While others flee danger, the firefighters, with sirens, red lights, horns, red-and-white trucks, charge into the jaws and midst of danger. Sometimes, the danger is overwhelming and firefighters are injured and killed.

Yesterday afternoon, with temperatures approaching 100 degrees outside, in an area called Forest Cove, near the San Jacinto River in Houston, Texas, the fire alarm sounded at the fire station. A house fire then turned into two alarms. The firefighters rushed and battled a fire in the hot, humid Texas summer heat.

Firefighter Daniel Groover was on the second floor of the house when he collapsed in the heat. He was pulled from the blaze by other firefighters, but later Daniel died.

Mr. Speaker, Daniel, like his dad, was a career firefighter.

Groover, a 21-year veteran of the Houston Fire Department, lived in

Spring, Texas. He was 46 years old. Daniel was married to Elia and had three sons.

Chief Terry Garrison said of Groover:

Firefighters risk a lot to save lives, and that's what Daniel was doing.

Daniel and his fellow firefighters are a remarkable breed, a rare breed—the American breed.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that all people are created equal, but a few become firefighters. One of those was Daniel Groover.

And that's just the way it is.

This is a list of the other Houston firefighters who have been killed in the line of duty in the last 12 months:

Captain EMT Matthew Renaud, 35, of Station 51;

Engineer Operator EMT Robert Bebee, 41, of Station 51;

Firefighter EMT Robert Garner, 29, of Station 68;

Probationary Firefighter Anne Sullivan, 24, of Station 68.

□ 2130

THESE ARE THE TIMES THAT TRY MEN'S SOULS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALMON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 15 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, "these are the times that try men's souls."

Having been to the border a couple of weeks ago, going to the border tomorrow and next weekend, I know from my experiences there that it is a traumatic time for so many. But I keep coming back to what a West African told me a few years ago when my wife and I were in West Africa with mercy ships, there in the harbor in Togo, caring for people there.

A number of the West Africans had wanted to meet before I left. They knew I was a Member of Congress. And the oldest, a very wise man, after we had a lovely time visiting, said, Well, we wanted to meet with you so that we could give you a message to take back to Washington. He said, we were so excited here in Africa when you elected your first black President of the United States. He said, but since that happened, we have seen America get weaker and weaker. And basically, he was saying that we know, as Christians, where we go when we die. But our chance of having peace in this life can only come if America is strong. So he implored me to go back and share here in Washington that Africa wants a strong America, that Africans who love peace want and need a strong America.

When I was in Nigeria recently visiting with heartbroken, devastated mothers of daughters who were kidnapped by radical Islamists, they wept as they would talk about their experiences. Three girls who had been captured and had been able to escape, their tales of the horrors of radical

Islam were sickening, especially for a father of three girls.

But again, the message there in Nigeria that was conveyed—different people, different ways, different words but, in essence, just as the elderly African gentleman had said a few years ago: Please stop getting weaker. You are hurting all of us. We need a strong America.

Mr. Speaker, a strong America means an America that abides by the law and does what is talked about throughout the Bible, about being impartial and fair. And that means enforcing the law impartially, that no matter who you are, we must enforce the law across the board. That means, whatever your age, wherever you are coming from, you must abide by the laws, just as the people who are American citizens do. It means that if we do not keep America strong economically by not spending more than we have coming in, have national security through our military and through our different departments and branches that are supposed to keep us secure, if we don't apply the law across the board and make sure that people attempting to come into this country have the law impartially enforced, we will not stay strong. We move into that Third World category where the law is unfairly enforced. It is enforced against different people to different measures.

And as someone, like me, who has been a judge and has had to look civil litigants and felons in the eye and tell them what the law required, even at times when I disagreed with the law but I knew it was constitutional, I applied the law because it is what must be done to keep America strong. Because when we begin to play favorites, we weaken America. When we cut our Defense Department just down to the nub and require them to do so many things with much less money, we are hurting our security. We are not remaining strong.

When we have a Fed that is creating money—and, as I was told at the Fed one day, oh, we can't possibly print all the money we are creating; we are just adding digits—they are cheapening the value of the dollar, and it will pay a toll someday. That weakens us.

We have got to abide by the law, and that means the President of the United States must do so. It means the Attorney General of the United States, the highest-ranking law enforcement officer, as Attorney General, must apply the law fairly, not unfairly and unjustly, and showing great partiality, as this Attorney General has been doing in his coverups, in his aggressively going after political enemies of the President, in his refusing and wholly failing and refusing to go after the IRS to investigate. It is very clear: the smell gets worse daily from those involved in the scandal at the IRS. And this Attorney General does nothing.

The message continues to go out around the world that the once great America no longer stands firmly on the

Constitution, stands firmly on the law, and enforces it across the board.

The chairman of the Judiciary, the gentleman from Virginia, BOB GOODLATTE, put together just a little note indicating things that the President can do without Congress doing anything more at all, things that this administration can do. And as my friend Chairman GOODLATTE points out, President Obama's policies have caused the crisis at our southern border. And he has tools at his disposal to fix it.

Here are several steps the President can take now to stop the surge at the border. Number one, send the strong public message that those who enter illegally will be returned. He can use the bully pulpit to make clear, you are not coming into the United States illegally. You come through our ports of entry, and you must come legally, or you will be returned from where you came.

Some have been coached, apparently—we hear and read—to claim asylum once you are here. Well, even under the Wilberforce bill, you don't get asylum if you are coming in from a country where you are not at risk.

Another point from Chairman GOODLATTE: Stop abusing prosecutorial discretion authority. Over the past 5 years, President Obama and administration officials have abused prosecutorial discretion, a tool that was meant to give the executive branch flexibility in individual cases. Instead, he stretched this authority beyond all recognition to shield entire categories of people, not researching individual cases to determine whether prosecutorial discretion would require non-prosecution, just exempting massive numbers of people. That is not discretion. That is mass amnesty. And this President has been doing it, and it has to stop. The message sent to the world is that if you get in the U.S., you will not be deported.

Stop releasing convicted criminal aliens from detention. Immigration and Customs Enforcement—and I don't blame them. I know too many ICE agents. They are good people. They want to do the right thing, but they have a Commander in Chief that is directing them to do the wrong thing. They have released over 36,000 criminal aliens from detention who were removed or were in removal proceedings or had been ordered removed. That is 36,000 criminal aliens.

You know, Texas has statistics indicating there have been over 100,000 criminal aliens responsible for over 600,000 crimes against American citizens. And what does this administration do? It protects and encourages criminality by failing to enforce the law. Implement tougher standards for credible fear claims.

Apparently, this administration is happy to just accept someone saying the words "credible fear." That is not a credible fear.

They can detain asylum seekers until their claims are proved valid. Instead,

this administration just gives a slip of paper that people coming in illegally think is their ticket to stay in the United States illegally. And it makes sense for them to think that because it tells them, they must report to a court in the United States at some point in the future. How can they report to the court if they don't stay in the United States illegally?

The President can also restore agreements with local law enforcement agencies and allow them to enforce immigration laws. That was our history. The Supreme Court, which is not concerned about precedent so much as they were supposed to be, decided that Arizona had to allow lawlessness because this administration was allowing lawlessness.

The administration can employ diplomatic resources to stop the border crisis. Let's look, for example, at these numbers. Well, for fiscal year 2014, El Salvador, which appears to be happy with thousands and thousands of its people coming illegally through Mexico to America—now we read that Mexico is actually complicit with some of these countries and is encouraging them, virtually, to come to America illegally. El Salvador, for fiscal year 2014, is supposed to get \$22,281,000 and for fiscal year 2015 is supposed to get \$27,600,000.

□ 2145

We are increasing by \$5 million the amount of money—at least the administration wants us to. Give \$5 million more to El Salvador—for what reason? Well, gee, I don't know. About the only thing they are known for right now is sending people illegally into the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Seeing no designee of the minority leader seeking recognition, under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the time until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. So it would seem to reasonable people, reasonable minds would think that, if El Salvador is costing America a huge hunk of what the President says needs to be \$3.7 billion to deal with the crisis that El Salvador is helping cause, then perhaps we ought to stop sending them money when they are costing us even more money.

So let's get this right. We are paying El Salvador to cost us billions of dollars in return. That doesn't seem to be a very good investment.

How about Guatemala? Gee, fiscal year 2014 has had \$65,249,000 appropriated to be given to Guatemala, and I have been down to the border in recent weeks and heard people say they were coming from Guatemala. Of course, they don't say, "We are coming from violence."

Violence seems to be down, certainly not up. It is certainly not spiking, so it

makes it clear that the reason that there is a huge spike in people rushing to America is because this Obama administration is making clear to Central America and South America that, if you come, you get to stay.

Why? Because they are not interested in what words politicians are saying here in Washington. They are more interested in what those politicians in the Obama administration are doing, and what they are doing is allowing hundreds of thousands of people to stay in America once they get here illegally.

For fiscal year 2015, apparently, this administration thinks that Guatemala is costing America what this administration says is a need for billions of dollars. Gee, they are doing such a good job of flooding us with immigrants, this administration is now asking, for the upcoming fiscal year, that we increase the \$65 million to \$77,107,000.

Then there is Honduras, \$41,850,000 in foreign assistance to Honduras. We have got people flooding up here from Honduras. So what does this administration do? Since Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador—their policies are actually causing people to rush to America because this President won't stand firm and enforce our borders and our laws.

The administration says let's give them an extra \$7 million for next year. Let's take \$41 million to \$48,176,000.

Even Mexico, our dear friends in Mexico, they just, in foreign assistance, were supposed to receive \$206,590,000, \$206,590,000 this year. Now, it is understandable that this administration would have a guilty conscience when it comes to Mexico because it was this administration—it was this Attorney General Eric Holder's Justice Department that forced the sale of 2,000 or so weapons to criminals they expected to go to the drug cartels in Mexico that we know have caused at least one American agent's death—Brian Terry—and suspected hundreds of deaths in Mexico.

If I were a Mexican official, I would be outraged at this administration. This is no way to perpetuate a strong America for future generations.

People say: What about the children? Well, let me tell you about a 16-year-old that came to me in tears. She said that she was driving there in Tyler, and an illegal alien without a driver's license and without insurance slammed his car into hers, and it totaled her car.

Since the family of this poor child consisted of this girl and her single mom and she and her mom, as she explained, were struggling to pay their bills—and to get by, she was working after school, and her mom was working all she could.

Even with her mom working as hard as she could and with her working after school and trying to study, they couldn't afford to pay for comprehensive on her car. All they could afford was liability, as the law requires. You

have to have at least liability, in case you cause an accident.

Her car was totaled. The illegal alien's car was damaged, but he was able to drive it away—was allowed to drive it away because this administration says: Hey, States, you can't enforce immigration law, it is only us that can do that, and we are not doing it.

That is what this administration's actions clearly show. For this poor child, she says: What do I do? We can't afford another car. We couldn't afford comprehensive insurance. We can't afford—we still have to pay that car off. How are we going to get by? We can't buy me another car, which means I can't get to work, which means I can't pay my bills; and my mom, she is doing all she can. She is heartbroken because now it means we can't get by.

Why? Because this administration's cynicism and cavalier attitude toward our laws and our border are allowing people to flood into this country illegally; and because this administration fights so hard, legally using every measure it can to keep States from using their own law enforcement to protect themselves, the States are not able to arrest illegal aliens.

So you wonder how many people have to suffer in this country before the law will be enforced and it will be impartially applied across the board.

How many times do we have to do damage to people in other countries who want to come legally, who have been spending money and time, year after year, to apply to come legally, when we are sending the message and doing them damage psychologically?

We make it clear: look, you ought to be cheating like these other people. Do you want to get in? Come illegally because this President won't send you back. It doesn't matter what he says. Don't look at his lips. Don't listen to his words. Look at what they are doing. They are not sending people back.

Think about all the children in American schools around this country—because this administration, to their credit, is trying to be fair and impartial with all the disasters they are causing, they are shipping people with disease, people who will not be able to help pay for their educations, they are shipping them all over the country, and it is going to cost the local communities and those States all over the country because this administration will not enforce the border.

Well, it is interesting, looking at one provision of the Constitution I haven't heard anybody talk about—we have been talking about it in my office. I have been talking with some friends about it. I called my constitutional law professor from Baylor University. He is looking at it. Well, what do you do?

Did the Founders ever think about what a State could do when the Federal Government refuses to protect them and the State is being invaded?

Mr. Speaker, what would you call it when about 300,000 people come into

your State in a matter of months—short months—and then the report comes that there are 300,000 or so people in the pipeline on their way up, and then we get the story in the news that Mexico has reached an agreement to facilitate more people coming from Guatemala?

Hey, we will let you come. Just come on. If you are going illegally into the United States, then consider free passage through Mexico.

That would seem to be a bit of a conspiracy between countries conspiring to help violate United States law. So what is this administration's response with regard to Mexico and Guatemala? Let's keep sending them millions of dollars.

Every dime ought to be cut off from any country that does not help the United States enforce our own laws, but if the United States, the Federal Government, the Obama administration won't enforce the laws, what is a State to do?

Well, if you look at article I, section 10, the third clause down there—the third provision in section 10—apparently, they anticipated times—I can't find that it has been used yet—but times when the Federal Government has not or will not or cannot protect a State from an invasion, then it says—the actual wording:

No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded.

There is a disjunctive “or” for another provision, but if a State is actually invaded, this says, basically, that the State can start putting taxes on things—traveling and interstate commerce—in order to pay for its ability to defend its borders.

It can call up troops. It can even use ships of war, even in times of peace. It can enter agreements with other States, say, New Mexico or Arizona, if they were interested, or even with a foreign country. If this is an invasion, Texas could enter agreements with Mexico directly, if there is an actual invasion.

So, Mr. Speaker, what do you call it when 300,000 people, twice as many as invaded France on D-day, come into your State so quickly and you get word 300,000 more are on their way up, and you know that those little children sitting in schoolrooms are going to have people forced in the rooms without any more money to provide for them?

So people ask: What about the children? It would seem that our oaths here in Congress should require us to provide for the common defense and to provide for those within our jurisdiction, that we should not encourage other countries against the will of the American people or against the will of any State to force them to assume hundreds of thousands of people that will bankrupt the State, bankrupt their schools, and do great damage to

their children and to their neighborhoods because the people are forced there by a government that refuses to follow the Constitution or the law.

We have interesting days ahead. May God give us wisdom and discernment to choose wisely.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 247. An act to establish the Harriet Tubman National Historical Park in Auburn, New York, and the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Caroline, Dorchester, and Talbot Counties, Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources;

In addition, to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 311. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating sites in the Lower Mississippi River Area in the State of Louisiana as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 354. An act to modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 363. An act to expand geothermal production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 476. An act to amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 11, 2014, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6312. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Sheep Industry Improvement Center [Doc. No.: AMS-LPS-14-0028] received June 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6313. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a emergency supplemental appropriations request for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014; (H. Doc. No. 113—130); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6314. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Captain Ross A. Myers and Captain John W. Tammen, Jr., United States Navy, to wear the authorized insignia of the

grade of rear admiral (lower half); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6315. A letter from the Director, Congressional Activities, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the "World Wide Threat Report"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6316. A letter from the Chairman, Appraisal Subcommittee, transmitting the 2013 Annual Report; to the Committee on Financial Services.

6317. A letter from the Acting Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Starke County, IN, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8333] received June 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6318. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Manufactured Housing Constructions and Safety Standards: Correction of Reference Standard for Anti-Scald Valves [Docket No.: FR-5787-F-01] (RIN: 2502-AJ21) received June 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6319. A letter from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting the June 2014 Report to Congress: Medicare and the Health Care Delivery System; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

6320. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6321. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Accounting Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, transmitting the 2013 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6322. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a piece of draft legislation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6323. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 131203999-4326-02] (RIN: 0648-XD020) received June 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6324. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; [Docket No.: 120705210-4423-03] (RIN: 0648-XC101) received June 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6325. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Greenland Turbot in the Aleutian Islands Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD260) received June 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6326. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, Na-

tional Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 140117052-4402-02] (RIN: 0648-XD298) received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6327. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures for the 2014 Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries for Pacific Whiting [Docket No.: 131119977-4381-02] (RIN: 0648-BD75) received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6328. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2014 Limited Commercial and Recreational Fishing Seasons for Red Snapper in the Southern Atlantic States [Docket No.: 121004515-3608-02] (RIN: 0648-XD307) received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6329. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 130214139-3542-02] (RIN: 0648-XD277) received June 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6330. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Emergency Rule to Revise the Recreational Accountability Measures and Revise the 2014 Recreational Fishing Season for Red Snapper in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 140416344-4344-01] (RIN: 0648-BE18) received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6331. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Fishing Restrictions for Pacific Bluefin Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean [Docket No.: 130722647-4403-02] (RIN: 0648-BD55) received June 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6332. A letter from the Staff Director, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting the Commission's report entitled, "2013 Annual Report and Sourcebook of Federal Sentencing Statistics", pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6333. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Allegheny River; Pittsburgh, PA [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0157] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6334. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra Fireworks Displays Ohio River, Mile 460.9 — 461.3; Cincinnati, OH [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0238] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received

June 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6335. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Terrebonne Bayou, LA [Docket Number: USCG-2013-1072] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6336. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; West Pearl River, Pearl River, LA [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0197] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6337. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Pelican Island Causeway, Galveston Channel, TX [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0063] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6338. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Tiburon's 50th Anniversary Fireworks, San Francisco Bay, Tiburon, CA [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0175] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received June 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6339. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Titusville, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2014-0279] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6340. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting a final report on the Neuse River Basin Ecosystem Restoration Project, North Carolina; (H. Doc. No. 113—131); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

6341. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the final report on Jordan Creek project in the City of Springfield, Greene County, Missouri; (H. Doc. No. 113—132); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

6342. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the integrated report on the Willamette River Floodplain Restoration Project, Lower Coast Fork and the Middle Fork, Oregon; (H. Doc. No. 113—133); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

6343. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the final report on the Walton County, Florida hurricane and storm damage reduction project; (H. Doc. No. 113—134); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and ordered to be printed.

6344. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of the determination of a waiver under Subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Turkmenistan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6345. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Changes to

Scheduling and Appearing at Hearings [Docket No.: 2011-0056] (RIN: 0960-AH37) received June 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6346. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting Naval Petroleum Reserves Annual Report of Operations for Fiscal Year 2013; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 5052. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to protect and conserve species and the lawful possession of certain ivory in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5053. A bill to amend the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 to provide for the expedited removal of unaccompanied alien children who are not victims of a severe form of trafficking in persons and who do not have a fear of returning to their country of nationality or last habitual residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 5054. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish within the Department of Veterans Affairs an Office of Whistleblower and Patient Protection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 5055. A bill to reform the housing finance system of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself and Mr. PETERS of California):

H.R. 5056. A bill to improve the efficiency of Federal research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 5057. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to permit exemptions for external power supplies from certain efficiency standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 5058. A bill to amend the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act to provide for State and tribal management and protection of wild free-roaming horses and burros, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BARBER, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HASTINGS of

Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. ROONEY):

H.R. 5059. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FALBOMAYAGA, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. LOFGREEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 5060. A bill to modify the requirements applicable to locatable minerals on public domain lands, consistent with the principles of self-initiation of mining claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 5061. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude extensions of credit made to veterans from the definition of a member business loan; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 5062. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to specify that privilege is maintained when information is shared by certain nondepository covered persons with Federal and State financial regulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 5063. A bill to promote the development of a commercial asteroid resources industry for outer space in the United States and to increase the exploration and utilization of asteroid resources in outer space; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HALL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H.R. 5064. A bill to require government-wide application of continuous process improvement methods to reduce waste and improve the effectiveness of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr.

LOWENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 5065. A bill to establish an integrated Federal program to respond to ongoing and expected impacts of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, restoring, and conserving the natural resources of the United States, and to maximize government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and tribal governments and other entities; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 5066. A bill to reauthorize the National Geological and Geophysical Data Preservation Program Act of 2005 through 2019; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 5067. A bill to require the Federal Insurance Office to carry out a study on illegal steering and redlining in the insurance industry; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 5068. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study regarding the proposed United States Civil Rights Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. FLEMING (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 5069. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase in the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 5070. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for improved compliance with the requirements of the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 5071. A bill to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to non-prohibited discharges of dredged or fill material under the Clean Water Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 5072. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a Federal renewable electricity standard for retail electricity suppliers and a Federal energy efficiency resource standard for electricity and natural gas suppliers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 5073. A bill to enhance consumer access to electricity information and allow for the adoption of innovative products and services to help consumers manage their energy usage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. JONES, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BARR, Mr. SALMON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HALL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.J. Res. 118. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8

of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the garnishment of non-Federal wages to collect delinquent non-tax debts owed to the United States without first obtaining a court order; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H. Res. 663. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State in Iraq and Levant (ISIL) as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. Res. 664. A resolution providing for the arrest of Lois G. Lerner to answer the charge of contempt of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DENT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. GRIMM):

H. Res. 665. A resolution condemning the murder of Israeli and Palestinian children in Israel and the ongoing and escalating violence in that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

231. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado, relative to House Joint Resolution 14-1012 requesting the Congress to increase the federal minimum wage and thereafter tie it to inflation; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

232. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Memorial 1174 urging Congress to direct the Environmental Protection Agency in developing guidelines for regulating carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil-fueled electric generating units; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

233. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 21 designating the month of April 2014 as "California Month of Remembrance for the Armenian Genocide of 1915-1923"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

234. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Vermont, relative to Joint Senate Resolution No. 27 petitioning the Congress to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 5052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5053.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 5054.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, "The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof"

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 5055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The primary constitutional authority for this bill is Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 5056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 5057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 5058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 allows Congress "[t]o make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 5059.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 5060.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 5061.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1. Section 8.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 5062.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 5063.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 5064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, under which Congress has the power “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof”

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 5066.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States:

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 5067.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause Article I, Section 8,

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 5068.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause Article I, Section 8,

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 5069.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, which states “The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.”

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 5070.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 7, and Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 5071.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 5072.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 5073.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.J. Res. 118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 40: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 140: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 223: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 274: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 303: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 449: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 477: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 486: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 532: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 543: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 565: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 594: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 640: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 806: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 830: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 949: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 997: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1091: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1284: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1289: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1337: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1518: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. SABLÁN, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1527: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1696: Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1750: Mr. SOUTHERLAND.

H.R. 1771: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1772: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1821: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1852: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1976: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2001: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 2066: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2084: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 2139: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2144: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 2149: Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD.

H.R. 2220: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 2263: Mr. ROHRBACHER.

H.R. 2278: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 2283: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 2305: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2315: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 2398: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 2529: Ms. ESTY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2536: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 2602: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 2692: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 2772: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2959: Mr. NUNES and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 3116: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3374: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 3383: Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 3456: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 3465: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 3482: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 3489: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 3543: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3580: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3662: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3673: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 3708: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 3717: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 3740: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3742: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 3833: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3899: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 3969: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 3978: Mr. POCAN and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3991: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3992: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 4013: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 4041: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4047: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 4059: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 4060: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 4075: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 4083: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 4119: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 4148: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 4169: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4190: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 4227: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 4250: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 4319: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 4351: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 4361: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 4365: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 4377: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 4404: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4408: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 4446: Mr. McDERMOTT and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 4449: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 4450: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 4462: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 4521: Mr. COOPER, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 4525: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 4551: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 4574: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 4582: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 4612: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 4628: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 4636: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. ROSKAM.
 H.R. 4651: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 4703: Mr. LATTI.
 H.R. 4765: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 4772: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 4773: Mr. MULVANEY.
 H.R. 4792: Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 4814: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
 H.R. 4816: Mr. VELA, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. RANDALL.
 H.R. 4826: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 4828: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 4841: Mr. SIRE.
 H.R. 4843: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 4865: Mr. MORAN, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. ESTY.
 H.R. 4902: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 4920: Mr. LATTI and Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 4933: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 4934: Mr. DAINES, Mr. LATTI, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 4936: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
 H.R. 4947: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 4951: Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 4958: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 4962: Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 4964: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4971: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 4978: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
 H.R. 4986: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 4989: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PEARCE.
 H.R. 4994: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 5009: Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 5014: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
 H.R. 5019: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. REED, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 5033: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 5038: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 5051: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. HIMES.

H.J. Res. 40: Mr. MARINO.
 H.J. Res. 113: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
 H. Con. Res. 69: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. BASS, and Mr. SIRE.
 H. Res. 85: Mr. MEEKS.
 H. Res. 231: Mr. MCCAUL and Mrs. NOEM.
 H. Res. 281: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H. Res. 428: Mr. YOHO.
 H. Res. 456: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H. Res. 525: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H. Res. 619: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H. Res. 620: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H. Res. 621: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H. Res. 623: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H. Res. 633: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H. Res. 657: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARINO, Mr. McALLISTER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIRE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. YODER, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4923

OFFERED BY: Mr. LAMALFA

AMENDMENT No. 24: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to regulate activities identified in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 404(f)(1) of the Federal Water

Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A), (C)) or to limit the exemption in section 404(f)(1)(A) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A)) to established or ongoing operations.

H.R. 4923

OFFERED BY: Mr. LAMALFA

AMENDMENT No. 25: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. **SACRAMENTO RIVER SETTLEMENT CONTRACTS.**

None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Bureau of Reclamation to terminate, or implement, administer, or enforce the termination of, the existing Sacramento River Settlement Contracts before the resolution of *Natural Resources Defense Council, et al. v. Jewell, et al.*, (9th Cir. Case No. 0917661 and USDC E.D. Cal. Case No. 05-cv-01207-LJO-GSA) through decision, dismissal, withdrawal or settlement.

H.R. 4923

OFFERED BY: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY OF NEW YORK

AMENDMENT No. 26: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the order entitled "Order Accepting Proposed Tariff Revisions and Establishing a Technical Conference" issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on August 13, 2013 (Docket No. ER13-1380-000).

H.R. 4923

OFFERED BY: Mr. MCKINLEY

AMENDMENT No. 27: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. 508. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to design, implement, administer, or carry out the United States Global Climate Research Program National Climate Assessment, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Fifth Assessment Report, the United Nation's Agenda 21 sustainable development plan, the May 2013 Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866, or the July 2014 Sustainable Development Solutions Network and Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations' pathways to deep decarbonization report.

H.R. 4923

OFFERED BY: Mr. MCKINLEY

AMENDMENT No. 28: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. 508. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to transform the National Energy Technology Laboratory into a government-owned, contractor-operated laboratory, or to consolidate or close the National Energy Technology Laboratory.